

on the printed calendar. When is it contemplated that the Senate shall meet again?

Mr. BARKLEY. I had contemplated asking that an adjournment be taken until Friday.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall not press the matter if the Senator from Oregon objects.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, there is no rule that cannot be waived here by unanimous consent; but unless there is something imperative, unless there is a great emergency, I think we should follow the rule of the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. I withdraw the request.

Mr. McNARY. If I may conclude, Mr. President, I will say that I am not going to object if the Senator from Texas can specify some reason why we should act today rather than Friday.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I cannot with the accuracy of a chronometer tell just how soon action should be taken, but in deference to the Senator from Oregon I will withdraw my request.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the Senator does that, it ought to be stated, I think, that the vacancy in our ambassadorship to Russia has been in existence now for several months. I think there is a special reason why action on that nomination ought to be consummated as soon as possible, although I do not know that 2 days would make any great amount of difference. I will say that the Minister designate to New Zealand—

Mr. CONNALLY. Is in that area.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; he is in that area now, and is charged with a very delicate mission, a very important mission, at least, and I presume it would be desirable to have his commission issued as soon as possible.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I realize that it is unusual to report nominations and ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration. I do not suppose the life of the Republic hangs on the question of whether the nominations are confirmed today or Friday. So if there is any lack of willingness to agree to immediate consideration, I shall withdraw the request, with the expectation of calling up the nominations for consideration on Friday. I say that without any spirit of irritation at all, because I desire to agree with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I always feel it a duty to have the Senate enforce its rules, and I try to have it do so in a spirit of fairness. I think the Senator from Texas probably has not shown a sufficient reason for the rule to be suspended. I shall cooperate with the Senator at the next meeting of the Senate on Friday so the nominations may have early and favorable consideration. Because of the rule of the Senate, and knowing that the Senator from Texas is willing to let the matter go over, I prefer that it go over.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to say that, so far as the range of my activities here are concerned, the Senator from Oregon is always highly

cooperative; he is a generous, gallant foe. Whenever possible, I want to agree with him, and it is not difficult for me to agree with him. So I withdraw the request.

TEMPORARY PROMOTION OF CERTAIN ARMY AIR CORPS OFFICERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2182) to provide for temporary promotion in the Army of the United States of officers commissioned in the Air Corps or assigned to duty with the Air Corps, which were, on page 1, line 3, to strike out all after "That" down to and including "President" in line 4, and insert "during any war in which the United States is now engaged," and on page 2, lines 20 and 21, to strike out "the war or national emergency concerned" and insert "any war in which the United States is now engaged."

Mr. REYNOLDS. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

ALLOWANCES FOR UNIFORMS AND EQUIPMENT OF RESERVE CORPS OFFICERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1891) to amend an act to provide allowances for uniforms and equipment for certain officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army so as to provide allowances for uniforms and equipment for certain officers of the Army of the United States.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, Senate bill 1891 which covers a uniform allowance of \$150 for officers of the Army, was amended in the House and passed yesterday, February 10. The House amendments are not acceptable.

I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House of Representatives, ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. GURNEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE REPORTS, SIGNING OF BILLS, ETC.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be authorized to make reports to the Senate during the recess or adjournment of the Senate; that the Vice President or the Presiding Officer of the Senate be authorized to sign bills and resolutions ready for his signature; and that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate adjourn until Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Sen-

ate adjourned until Friday, February 13, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 11, 1942:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Ollie L. Stewart, Haleyville.

TENNESSEE

Charles L. Wells, Byrdstown.

Leonard F. Robinette, Mosheim.

John C. Pope, Springfield.

L. Irene Rose, Tazewell.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed be Thou, O Lord our God, for Thou hast a balm in Gilead for the cure of the sins of men. Thou who hast appointed our time and place in this human world; Thou art a God imminent in all things, the inspiration of hope and strength. Grant that there may be in us a higher understanding and a conscience, willing to be guided aright. O Saviour, crowned not for Thine own glory, with power for the emancipation of all spirits, let us hear Thy voice in the silence.

Almighty God, for America, the human dream, the ageless hope of man, enable her to beat a pathway through the tides of military vandalism, emerging immortal over against the darkness of paganism. O Master of her soul, forgive our compromises, our ease, and our smug selfishness, and we pray that all ranks of her citizens may go on and on, toiling, sacrificing, and praying for national deliverance from the evils and horrors of wicked aggressors. We earnestly pray for our President and all who are united with him in authority and responsibility that they may be guided through these perilous and critical times. Oh, gird their souls for their mighty tasks. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 314. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens.

PERSONS DISCHARGED FROM THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES ON ACCOUNT OF FRAUDULENT ENLISTMENT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1782) to authorize the payment of a donation and to provide for the travel at Government expense of persons discharged from the Army of the United States on account of fraudulent enlistment, with a House amend-

ment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAY, THOMASON, HARTER, ANDREWS, and SHORT.

WITHDRAWAL OF BRANDY FOR FORTIFICATION OF WINES AND PRODUCTION OF WINES, BRANDY, AND FRUIT SPIRITS

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5802) to amend certain provisions of the law relative to the withdrawal of brandy for fortification of wines and production of wines, brandy, and fruit spirits so as to remove therefrom certain unnecessary restrictions, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 2, line 6, after "cantaloup brandy", insert "; and by inserting at the end of the first paragraph the following new sentence: 'The maximum penal sum of any bond required by this subchapter for any bonded winery or bonded storeroom shall be \$50,000.'"

Page 4, after line 20, insert:

"(h) Clause (2) of section 5 (f) of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act (49 Stat. 984) is amended to read as follows: '(2) as will provide the consumer with adequate information as to the identity and quality of the products advertised, the alcoholic content thereof (except the statements of, or statements likely to be considered as statements of, alcoholic content of malt beverages and wines are prohibited), and the person responsible for the advertisement;'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill relates to the withdrawal of wine from bond, as I understand?

Mr. BUCK. No.

Mr. RICH. I should like to know what this bill contains.

Mr. BUCK. The bill was passed by the House last session and passed by the Senate with these two amendments. This bill has nothing whatever to do with the withdrawal from bond. The bill the gentleman has in mind is one, I think, that will be reported or is about to be reported from the Committee on Ways and Means. This has nothing to do with that.

Mr. RICH. What does this bill do?

Mr. BUCK. The first amendment fixes the maximum sum of a wine maker's bond at \$50,000. It prohibits the advertising of the alcoholic content of wines.

Mr. RICH. Why should not the people know what the alcoholic content of a wine is?

Mr. BUCK. We already prohibit such advertising with regard to what are known as dry wines, wines under 14 percent. This bill simply extends this prohibition to the whole category of wines.

Mr. RICH. In the advertising of wines or the labeling of wines they are supposed—

Mr. BUCK. No, labeling is another matter entirely, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Is there anything in this bill that takes away from the public knowledge they now have?

Mr. BUCK. Not at all.

Mr. RICH. If the bill prohibits the advertising of the alcoholic content of wines, would not that be a detriment to the public?

Mr. BUCK. I do not understand so. I cannot see that.

Mr. RICH. The public ought to know what the alcoholic content of a wine or liquor is, should it not?

Mr. BUCK. That is not required at the present time, except in the case of the sweet wines. That is all its affects. This is an amendment adopted by the Senate in its wisdom.

Mr. RICH. I do not care whether the Senate adopted it or not; if it is not for the benefit of the public, then I do not want the bill to go through.

Mr. BUCK. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I think it is of benefit to the public.

Mr. RICH. In what way will it benefit the public?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman from California has the floor. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I am glad the gentleman from California has the floor and is willing to yield to me. I want to reiterate my attitude on this proposition entirely.

I understand that this legislation is for the benefit of certain sellers of intoxicating liquor. I am not interested in their business, but I am interested in putting a stop to advertising intoxicating liquors over the radio and enabling every "flannel-mouthed" liquor propagandist to invade every Christian home and advertise liquor that every intelligent man knows is detrimental to grown people, much less children, and in that way corrupt the morals of the American people in spite of all that Christian fathers and mothers can do. If the committee really wants to do something for the American people, let it bring out a bill that squares with honest American principles and put a stop to advertising intoxicating liquors over the radio. I am speaking now for the millions of Christian people who are resenting what is going on over the radio every day and every night.

Mr. BUCK. I may say to my good friend that this bill has nothing to do with that.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Of course, it has nothing to do with that; it is merely a squabble between certain liquor dealers; that is what it is.

Mr. BUCK. No; it is not; I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Some of them want to sell liquor a little more cheaply than others. They do not want to advertise the price. They are all willing to advertise the sale of liquor and to lie to the American people about how much good it will do them and their

children, but this is for their own selfish interests. Let us legislate for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to object for the present and urge that they can bring a bill or an amendment to protect the Christian homes of America. For the present, I object.

Mr. BUCK. This is not a bill of that kind; I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. It ought to be. Let us legislate for the Christian men and women of America in this matter and for the protection of their children.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference with the Senate.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I object, for the time being.

SAM HARDY, MESSENGER TO COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOEHNE. Sam Hardy, the courteous, able, and efficient messenger to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, recently completed 34 years of service to that committee on February 9, 1942. During these years Sam has served under eight chairmen, namely, Hon. Sereno E. Payne, of New York; Hon. Oscar W. Underwood, of Alabama; Hon. Claude Kitchin, of North Carolina; Hon. Joseph W. Fordney, of Michigan; Hon. William R. Green, of Iowa; Hon. James W. Collier, of Mississippi; Hon. Willis C. Hawley, of Oregon; and Hon. Robert L. Doughton, of North Carolina.

Sam is honest, reliable, faithful, capable, and trustworthy. He has at all times rendered a very valuable service to the committee members and staff.

His exceptional knowledge of the public documents relating to matters within the jurisdiction of the committee make his services particularly valuable and his work unique. There are five large storerooms, crowded with thousands of documents of all descriptions, some of them very valuable and rare. The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation also maintains a storeroom for documents of particular use to that committee. It requires an excellent memory and extensive information to locate these numerous documents, especially those printed during the early sessions of the Congress.

Every 2 years, or oftener, as the need arises, the committee binds a set of all documents, bills, and reports published by the committee for the use of each member of the committee, the staff, and the committee library. Sam collects all of these documents and assembles them for binding and performs a like service for the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

The committee library, in the rear of the committee room, is one of the best equipped on the Hill. It contains many

irreplaceable documents, as well as all volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from 1789 to the present, and the United States Reports from volume 1 to the current edition. The care of this library is another of Sam's duties and one of which he is justly proud.

Sam has also found time to be a part of his community, and for 22 years has been secretary and financial secretary to the board of stewards of the Metropolitan A. M. E. Church, as well as serving as reading clerk to the church.

Clerks and members of the committee, who have occasion to call on Sam's varied abilities and excellent memory, will testify to the unfailing courtesy and cheerfulness with which he performs his tasks. They have come to rely upon him for many services and do not like to think of the day when Sam will have retired and a less well-informed messenger will have taken his place.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, certainly nothing can be added to the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BOEHNE] relative to the faithful services of Sam Hardy, messenger to the Ways and Means Committee. There is, perhaps, only one remark I might add to what the gentleman has so well said—namely, that there is only one Member now of this House who was a Member of the House when Sam Hardy first became employed by the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. There could be no better credit given to Sam than the record he has made, which has been most satisfactory to every member of the Ways and Means Committee during a period of 34 years, with service under eight different chairmen. As the gentleman from Indiana has so well said, he is thoroughly conversant with all the duties to be performed by one in his position. We wish him continued success in his life's calling, and as one member of the Ways and Means Committee I certainly hope he may be continued in health to serve the committee as well in the future as he has in the past.

I congratulate Sam Hardy on his long, faithful, and successful career as one of the highly efficient employees of this Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I think it is a very fine thing to see the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BOEHNE] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] pay honor to a loyal employee of the House, a man who has served the Ways and Means Committee for 34 years, serving under eight chairmen.

It was my pleasure during my 10 years of membership on that important and powerful committee to observe him; efficient, loyal, a man of honorable instincts, and an inspiration and example to all. It is not only fitting, but I think it is very fine for us to pause and hear Members pay a tribute of respect to a man of comparative humble position so far as other positions in the House are concerned, but one who loves his work. I join in honoring Sam Hardy, this fine employee of the House who had been connected with the Ways and Means Committee for so many years, during which he performed such loyal and honorable service.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, this day marks the thirty-fourth anniversary of Sam Hardy as messenger to the Committee on Ways and Means. They have been 34 years of faithful, conscientious service, and we who know Sam for his real worth hope that he may be with us for many, many more years. He is invaluable to us.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure and never a task for one to give expressions to his kindly feelings when he is discussing one who has shown him acts of kindness and courtesy and has rendered real service.

Samuel Hardy is my friend and he has demonstrated it many times. I am his friend, but maybe I have not demonstrated it as much as I should. I am his friend because I recognize in him some of the finest traits of character. He has served the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives for many years and his service has been conspicuous for fidelity and for devotion to duty. In a way he is as much a part of this Congress and the activities of the Government as any of us. He has not been elected but he has been selected year after year for approximately 30 years and his standing with those responsible for his appointment is as high as it could possibly be.

Sam is a leader among the colored people of this city and has identified himself very actively with the church and with all of the best things in life. I am glad to say of him in the lines of a hymn writer that fidelity pays. This is the first stanza of the hymn to which I refer:

Not to the strong is the battle,
Not to the swift is the race,
But to the true and the faithful,
Victory is promised through grace.

MELVYN DOUGLAS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to read a telegram which I received this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, this telegram is dated Los Angeles, Calif., and is addressed to me:

Following is a statement released by the Screen Actors' Guild, "The appointment of Melvyn Douglas as a nonsalaried Civilian Defense worker was strongly endorsed by the board of directors of the Screen Actors' Guild in a telegram to Dean James M. Landis, Director of Civilian Defense. The Guild said in the last war Melvyn Douglas ran away from home to enlist in the Army and contribute what he could to his country in this war. Melvyn Douglas is giving up lucrative screen employment to work without pay coordinating the use of creative talent to help sell Victory bonds to carry on public information work and otherwise to aid the war efforts. Actors have done a great deal in the war effort and want to do more. They have contributed time and talent without stint to war entertainment activities. Since Pearl Harbor they have sold millions of dollars worth of Victory bonds. They have raised large sums for the Red Cross, infantile paralysis fund, and other humanitarian agencies. The defense agency which Mr. Douglas will head will coordinate further use of the talents of actors, writers, directors, graphic artists, and others. In appointing Mr. Douglas the Office of Civilian Defense appointed the man with the kind of experience needed to do the job. While some Congressmen have been getting publicity by making insulting remarks about actors, actors have been working to win the war. So long as there are war jobs to do actors will do them. One of our number recently showed the spirit of actors when she carried out her Government assignment at the cost of her life. She might have stayed home but that is not the actors' way, not the American way."

TRANSPORTATION OF HOUSEHOLD GOODS OF CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1526) to amend the act approved October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1105), to permit such responsible officers as may be designated by the heads of departments or establishments to authorize or approve the allowance and payment of expenses incident to the transportation of the household goods of civilian officers and employees when transferred from one official station to another for permanent duty.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the regular business of the day, and any special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

THOMAS ALVA EDISON

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, in these dark days it behooves us this morning to turn our thoughts away for the moment from war in order to mark the ninety-fifth anniversary of the birth of one of New Jersey's most illustrious citizens, the late Thomas Alva Edison, who, by his genius, contributed to the progress of the human race rather than to its destruction. His

name will be cherished when Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japanese war lords are but an unhappy memory.

PENSION FOR OLD FOLKS

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and extend and revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LANDIS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

TRANSPORTATION OF GOODS OF CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request and ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1526) to amend the act approved October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1105), to permit such responsible officers as may be designated by the heads of departments or establishments to authorize or approve the allowance and payment of expenses incident to the transportation of the household goods of civilian officers and employees when transferred from one official station to another for permanent duty, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman from Missouri kindly explain the purpose of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes with a unanimous report from the committee. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy have telephoned to urge that this legislation be expedited. Under existing law, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, and the Commandant of the Coast Guard must personally sign a voucher transferring civilians. Military and naval units are being transferred every day; but when the enlisted men and officers go ahead, if the vouchers are not signed for the transfer of the civilian employees, they cannot go with their units. They have been flying some of these vouchers all the way to Washington from some of the camps and flying them back again.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does this state the number of people who can be designated?

Mr. COCHRAN. No. It simply permits the Secretaries to designate a responsible officer to sign the papers, rather than the head of the department personally, as now required under the present law. Undoubtedly it will be the corps area commander. The explanation before the committee is that this will save money by not requiring these vouchers to be sent to Washington. The various departments mentioned, the Comptroller General, as well as the Director of the Budget, ask for this legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1105), be, and hereby is, amended by inserting, after the clause "when specifically authorized or ap-

proved by the head of the department or establishment concerned", the words "or by such responsible officer or officers of the department or establishment concerned as the head thereof may designate for that purpose."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months thereafter any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made available for expenses of travel of civilian officers and employees of the War and Navy Departments and the Coast Guard shall be available also for expenses of travel performed by them on transfer from one official station to another when authorized by such responsible officer or officers of the department concerned as the head thereof may designate for that purpose in the order directing the travel: *Provided*, That such expenses shall not be allowed for any transfer effected for the convenience of the officer or employee."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read: "An act to provide decentralization of the issuance of orders authorizing the payment of travel expenses in connection with the transfer of civilian employees from one station to another."

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a tribute to Abraham Lincoln by a former Member of this House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 278. Joint resolution making an appropriation to provide financial aid to China.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution amending section 7 of the Neutrality Act of 1939.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1891) entitled "An act to amend an act to provide allowances for uniforms and equipment for certain officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army so as to provide allowances for uniforms and equipment for certain officers of the Army of the United

States," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. GURNEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2182. An act to provide for temporary promotion in the Army of the United States of officers commissioned in the Air Corps or assigned to duty with the Air Corps.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the War Production Board issued a press release stating that—

War funds already authorized, plus net appropriations in bills at present before Congress, total an estimated \$116,000,000,000.

The newspapers announced the President would shortly submit requests for additional appropriations amounting to \$26,740,000,000. If this request is met by the Congress, the totals appropriated for the present war effort will be \$142,740,000,000. And that is for war alone. Now, besides this sum, we have the task of maintaining the ordinary functions of government, of providing for the veterans of former wars, and keeping up all of the independent agencies of the Government. Mr. Speaker, \$142,740,000,000 is a lot of money. In the 709,000 days since the birth of Christ there has never been any spending to equal this, and if the money were distributed pro rata over each day since that time the spending would be at the rate of \$201,185 per day.

Coupled with our national debt of over \$60,000,000,000, this expenditure of \$142,740,000,000, most of which must obviously be national debt, it is apparent that we will wind up with a national debt of nearly \$200,000,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, how are we going to pay this debt? Where are we going to get the money?

Mr. Speaker, I warn the House of Representatives and the Senate they should scan every appropriation to save every penny or we will bankrupt our Nation. If we go bankrupt we will lose in our effort to win the terrible war we are now engaged in. We should use every effort to win; we will be compelled to sacrifice to win. We must do our all to win the war. Let us make every penny count.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the

RECORD and to include an address I made on Thomas A. Edison.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

RIVERS AND HARBORS LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks and to include therein a letter from the President of the United States and a statement from Judge MANSFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FINANCIAL AID TO CHINA

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 278, making an appropriation to provide financial aid to China, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 8, strike out all after the word "approved" down to and including "1943", in line 12, and insert "February 7, 1942, and remain available until June 30, 1943."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what effect does this amendment have?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as House Joint Resolution 278 was introduced before the authorizing legislation was approved by the President, we provided in this joint resolution that it could not become effective until the authorizing resolution had become law. The President has signed the authorization and there is no longer any necessity for that limitation. The Senate therefore struck it out and inserted the date of approval of the authorization act—House Joint Resolution 276.

Mr. TABER. The only effect of the amendment is to strike out the limitation and substitute the date on which the bill was signed?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is all.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the Senate amendment be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Senate amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFENSE HOUSING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 437 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of

the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6483) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this bill makes in order H. R. 6483, the so-called District of Columbia housing bill, which authorizes an appropriation of \$50,000,000 to relieve an acute shortage of housing, public works, and equipment therefor presently existing and impending in and near the District of Columbia and which are impeding war activities.

I am not aware of any opposition to either the rule or bill and, therefore, will not take up the time in explanation of the rule or the provisions of the bill. However, the matter of the overcrowded conditions in Washington has held my interest for the past year, and I have sought to relieve the situation by the introduction of several bills and resolutions which would authorize the decentralization and removal of certain bureaus and agencies from Washington. For the information of the House, I shall ask permission to insert at this point House Joint Resolution 198, which I introduced on June 20, 1941, as well as my remarks at a hearing of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds held on July 24, 1941:

Joint resolution creating a committee to investigate the feasibility of transferring certain bureaus and agencies of the Government from the District of Columbia, and for other purposes

Whereas, due to the national defense program, many new bureaus and agencies of the Government have been created, and established bureaus and agencies expanded in operation, necessitating the employment of approximately 35,000 additional employees and resulting in a definite shortage in office facilities and housing accommodations and in acute traffic congestion in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas the number of employees entering the Government service is increasing, making certain a still greater overcrowding and congestion of office facilities and housing accommodations therein, and tending to lowered efficiency and increased expenditures in such agencies and to higher living costs to such employees; and

Whereas the city of Chicago is the railroad center of the United States, centrally located and accessible from and to all sections of the country, and has available modern office buildings ready for immediate occupancy and obtainable at reasonable rentals as well as suitable and adequate housing accommodations to provide for any increase in numbers of Government employees, with lowered living costs to them; and

Whereas various bureaus and agencies of the Government may be properly removed from the District of Columbia not only without impairing, but indeed to the improve-

ment of, the efficiency of their operations: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That (a) there is hereby established a committee to be composed of nine members, three of whom shall be Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, three of whom shall be Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the remaining three of whom shall consist of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Coordinator of Defense Housing, and the Commissioner of Public Buildings. The committee shall select one of its members to act as chairman.

(b) It shall be the duty of the committee to investigate—

(1) the feasibility and desirability of transferring from the District of Columbia to central locations outside the District of Columbia of any of the bureaus or agencies of the Government of the United States;

(2) the location, extent, and cost to the United States of office space and other facilities rented by the various departments, bureaus, and agencies of the United States, both within and without the District of Columbia.

The committee shall report from time to time during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with any recommendations for legislation which it may deem proper.

(c) The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and of any of the agencies of the Government.

[Hearings before the subcommittees of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, House of Representatives]

STATEMENT OF HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

The CHAIRMAN. We are glad to have with us Mr. SABATH, who introduced the resolution pending before the committee.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, many Members of Congress and hundreds of people have appealed to me to see whether something could be done to relieve the condition here, because the Members themselves found it impossible to find living quarters; people coming down here are unable to find quarters in hotels where they can remain for even 2 or 3 days; and visitors are unable to find space where they can remain for a few days.

When these conditions came to my attention and, of course, I am personally familiar with them, because I have received myself many requests from delegations asking me to make reservations for people whom they have invited here, and some who have business before the departments, from businessmen and professional men, and I have found it impossible to obtain reservations for them.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we have all had that experience.

Mr. SABATH. In view of that fact I finally decided to urge that something be done. I have written to the President calling his attention to conditions, believing that he would have jurisdiction without any legislation, but realizing the fact that he is terribly busy, occupied with international affairs, I did not press it; I did not have the heart to press it, although I consider it of great importance.

So, consequently, I introduced a resolution. I introduced a concurrent resolution creating a committee: Three from the House, three from the Senate, and three gentlemen from the departments, having knowledge and experience and information relative to the overcrowded conditions here. But after talking with the Speaker he came to the conclusion that it would be better if the House itself would take the matter on and that it would receive the proper attention and consideration. In view of his recommendation I

introduced another resolution, and when the matter was presented to the Rules Committee, the Rules Committee unanimously recognized the need of some action and reported out the resolution.

I then informed the Speaker that I could not be one of the members of that committee, and that I could not be chairman of such a committee, because as chairman of the Rules Committee the duties are such as not to permit me to take on any additional work. I have plenty of work to do without taking on any additional duties. In view of that fact, you are considering the situation in my resolution today and I hope you will give it the consideration to which it is entitled.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. SABATH, the resolution deals with a matter in which we are all very much interested. And I should like to outline the method that seems advisable for getting this information.

In view of the fact, of course, that the Dupont Circle apartment house situation has been referred to a great deal and that there are incidents connected with that growing out of the present situation, we thought that during such time as we have today and tomorrow we would give attention first to that particular situation. Then it is our purpose next week to ask representatives of these various departments to come before us with reference to such agencies as you have mentioned, concerning their operation and the people affected by them and to ascertain their judgment whether these bureaus and agencies should be decentralized; and then also to get from various cities where these agencies could be located information and data with respect to that situation.

Since Mr. DIRKSEN has made a statement which is rather staggering concerning the situation in Chicago, particularly in the Loop area where they have been unable to pay taxes, and since we are paying a very considerable sum for rental for these agencies, in spite of the many Government buildings that we have, at least we should consider the feasibility of utilizing such vacancies.

Now, is that, in your judgment, the proper course for us to pursue in such investigation as we make? We would like to have your judgment on it.

Mr. SABATH. Of course, the resolution concerning the Dupont Circle apartment house matter is before the Rules Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. We appreciate that.

Mr. SABATH. I will be only too delighted if the Rules Committee will be relieved of that investigation and if you gentlemen will look into the unfair tactics that have been used concerning the taking over of that building, but I think also the committee should have a general investigation of the whole situation.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. DOWNS, who introduced that resolution, is a member of this committee; he has been out there and knows what the circumstances are.

Mr. SABATH. I am pleased to know that. On a few of the promises that were made to the people I think you should secure certain information. And I am going to be very brief in my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Take your time, Mr. SABATH.

Mr. SABATH. All I want to say is that the report from the Appropriations Committee shows the need and recommendations have been made to the House that something should be done and must be done.

The CHAIRMAN. What report is that?

Mr. SABATH. I refer to page 32, a part of the report from the Appropriations Committee, made by Mr. TAVVER, who is a very careful man; and they have given that matter consideration and they thought something should be done.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that part of the report you refer to should be incorporated in the record.

Mr. SABATH. It is on page 32 of the report of the Appropriations Committee on the Department of Labor and Federal Security Agency, for this session.

(The excerpt referred to follows:)

"A supplemental estimate affecting the operations of this Bureau (Social Security Board) was submitted in House Document No. 211 wherein it was proposed to authorize the Social Security Board to enter into leases for periods of not more than 5 years for office and storage space outside the District of Columbia to house this function of the Board. The committee has not acceded to the request for the insertion of this language in the bill. The Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance is a completely integrated unit of operation and one that can very well be decentralized and operated at any place in the United States as well as it could be operated in Washington or Baltimore. At the present time the Bureau is operating in Baltimore, Md., and is unable to find adequate space to house the expanding activities of the Bureau. The committee is of the opinion that the Board should survey other cities in the United States for the purpose of locating a place where this unit of Government can move and be assured not alone of building facilities sufficient for the operation of the office, but also adequate and reasonably priced housing facilities for the employees. The defense program has projected a very serious housing situation in Washington and everything possible must be done to decentralize Government activities and have them established in areas outside of the confines of Washington in cases where there will be no impairment in productive or efficiency factors as a result of such decentralization. The Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance lends itself to this possibility of decentralization" (H. Rept. No. 688, 77th Cong., 1st sess., on Department of Labor, etc., appropriations.)

Mr. SABATH. Two years ago, if I am not mistaken, another committee made a recommendation in favor of passing an act concerning the feasibility of bringing about the removal of some of the Bureaus here in Washington. That is in the act, Public Act, I think, No. 113.

The CHAIRMAN. Of what Congress?

Mr. SABATH. Of the Seventy-fifth Congress. That provided for the establishment of the Temporary National Economic Committee, hereafter referred to as the committee, to be composed of three Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, three Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, and three other members, one, respectively, from each of the following departments or agencies to be designated by the respective heads thereof: Department of Justice, Department of the Treasury, and Department of Labor for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not some of these departments could be moved outside of the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they make the investigation, Mr. SABATH?

Mr. SABATH. No. This is the act.

The CHAIRMAN. When was that passed?

Mr. SABATH. That was in 1938, long before we had these overcrowded conditions, and that was due to the tremendous cost which has been referred to by our colleague, Mr. DIRKSEN, as to the expense of travel to the Government, running between \$100,000,000 and \$150,000,000, most of which could be saved if these bureaus could be properly allocated in sections of the country where much of this work has to be done.

The CHAIRMAN. And it would also save the people a great deal of expense when they have to do business with these departments?

Mr. SABATH. Yes. The cost to the people of the United States in coming to Washington from all sections of the country, if these bureaus were more centrally located, would

not only save them a great deal of time and money but would relieve the conditions existing here.

Now, I feel that something must be done. I recall when I came to Congress the District of Columbia had a population of 180,000. Today it has over 600,000. It is true we have been building and spending tremendous sums of money, but notwithstanding that fact we are paying today in the District of Columbia over \$5,000,000 rental.

I can understand, and I suppose if I was the head of a bureau I would have the same inclination to be in Washington. It is a beautiful city, a clean city, and it is only natural that people want to be close by where things are being done.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Sabath, you stated that there was felt the need for this in 1938?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. Why has this not been done before, previous to this emergency that we are supposed to be facing now, when evidently there was time to give the matter attention in 1938? If I remember correctly, the Congress adjourned in June, did it not, in 1938?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; but unfortunately we have been rather busy and the Congress has been rather busy from 1933 up to now; we did not have so much time.

The CHAIRMAN. This particular committee did not object to such legislation.

Mr. SABATH. No. No action has been taken. This matter again has just been called to our attention only a little while ago and I have even forgotten that such action has been taken.

Now, everyone knows that I have not been unfriendly to the District of Columbia. I am proud of our Capital, but at the same time we must take into consideration there are other sections of the country and I do not believe that everything must be done right here in the District when we have so many other splendid locations and cities that have available space, available buildings, available living quarters.

Now, I did insert in the resolution the city of Chicago because I know it is the most centrally located city in the United States and I know we have a great deal of vacant office space there.

The CHAIRMAN. That is in line with the statement made by Mr. DIRKSEN with reference to vacancies in the Loop district.

Mr. SABATH. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but there are a tremendous number of large office buildings that have not been able to pay their taxes for years; many of them have been sold for taxes; and, we have torn down in the Loop district at least 20 buildings because they could not be rented. I know that Chicago has suffered more than any other city from the twenties on.

The CHAIRMAN. Chicago has not been aided very much in the defense spending?

Mr. SABATH. Absolutely none of that is coming our way, although we have a splendid location; it is the hub of the United States; we have facilities, but somehow or other we are being bumped here, and naturally the Federal activities have been centralized elsewhere.

The CHAIRMAN. Are residential houses available, as well as business houses, in Chicago?

Mr. SABATH. Let me tell you about the residences: Due to the fact that much activity is away from Chicago, and that the new developments are taking places for the new needed national defense program, we have lost around 50,000 mechanics because there is no work for them in Chicago. They have been taken to Detroit, or moved to New England, and many of them into the South as well as on the west coast. Today we have 45,000 vacant flats and it is heartbreaking. I do not know what we are going to do.

Now, it may seem that I am pleading to you for Chicago. I merely call attention to the available space in Chicago because the Government could save money and the people could save money and time if some of these bureaus were relocated.

It may be that some of these bureaus could be transferred to St. Louis. Some of them have been transferred to Denver. Some of them can be transferred somewhere else.

I have a list of the bureaus which I think could be transferred to some other place and remove the condition existing here, save money to the Government and cost to people doing business with the Government if they were transferred to some other city.

I do not want to have it said that I am advocating New York or Philadelphia or St. Louis or Cincinnati or Omaha because some of these perhaps should not be in Chicago. But many of them can be located to advantage in Chicago.

Now, I know we cannot transfer any bureau of the Departments of War or State or Navy; but the General Land Office, and we have many bureaus in other departments, such as the Grazing Service, Indian Affairs, Reclamation Service, Bureau of Mines, Bureau of Fisheries and Wildlife. I do not think those bureaus should be here. A better place for them would be in Chicago, where conditions are much better.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Is that due to the activities of the Kelly-Nash machine?

Mr. SABATH. Well, let me say this, during the entire administration of Kelly there has not been an unfriendly newspaper that could say anything against it. He has given the city of Chicago a real honest and business-like administration, nothing like we had under Big Bill Thompson, who nearly brought about chaos in Chicago, and we have been obliged to work all of these years to rehabilitate, reconstruct and to establish the fair name of Chicago and today I will say, come to Chicago and you will find about as orderly a city and as clean a city as you will find anywhere. Some of you might not have been in Chicago during the last Democratic convention—

Mr. MCGREGOR. I was not there then.

Mr. SABATH. Well, you should have been there. But the point is that we demonstrated what a splendid city it was, that everybody could enjoy their stay, and I have not heard of a complaint from a single person as to not having been properly taken care of and treated as one feels they should be treated in a well-regulated city.

We have a splendid streetcar system; we are now completing a wonderful highway system.

Mr. WILSON. Are all the nitwits in Chicago on the police force?

Mr. SABATH. Well, let me tell you this: We were not obliged to change the department at all, and I am glad to tell you that I have not seen a single scratch in the papers, the most unfriendly papers, about the Chicago police. I know they are not all perfect; there is nothing perfect in the world.

Mr. WILSON. Just let me tell you this, because I think you will be interested in it: The last time I was driving through Chicago I created an error, and some policeman said, "You know all the nitwits in Indiana drive automobiles."

Mr. SABATH. Of course, they are not all perfect.

Mr. GIBSON. Did I understand you to say that Chicago was the most centrally located city in the United States?

Mr. SABATH. I mean large city; it is the hub of the railroad facilities, and now it is an airplane city, and out on the Lakes you have water transportation, and everything else is easily accessible for bringing things to Chicago.

But I am not only advocating Chicago; please understand that. Naturally I am bringing to you the conditions in Chicago, and that there are plenty of available offices and office space at low rentals, and the people working in those offices could obtain accommodations there much cheaper than they could here or perhaps in most any other city.

Mr. BELL. Of course, Kansas City is more centrally located. Would there be any objection to striking out the word "Chicago" where it appears in the resolution and substituting therefor "Kansas City"?

Mr. SABATH. Well, if you have the office space there available and if conditions are as favorable in your city as they are in Chicago, I would not object to some of these bureaus and agencies going to Kansas City.

Mr. HARRIS. I was very much interested in your description of what is happening to Chicago since the depression began in 1929. Is not Chicago receiving any benefit from this tremendous defense program and the results of the spending?

Mr. SABATH. No.

Mr. HARRIS. Is that right?

Mr. SABATH. Very little. There is not a single one of these big plants located anywhere within Chicago. I think the nearest plant is somewhere around 25 or 30 miles away from Chicago and they are creating a new town there, and naturally people from Chicago move in that direction. Of course we never did have any automobile factories or airplane factories or the big guns or ammunition plants. We do not have the plants for the gun mounts, or facilities for building war vessels or for big boats. We do have facilities for small boats and I pleaded with the Navy Department to allocate some of the money to the Great Lakes, but nothing has been done. So, we are suffering on account of conditions there more than any other city in the United States.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to ask you one more question: If some of these departments or bureaus or independent agencies were moved to Chicago or to some other city, would you advocate, Mr. SABATH, their removal as a permanent or temporary matter; and if they were to be located there permanently would you then advocate a continuation of their occupying rental quarters or do you think the Government should build structures to take care of these activities?

Mr. SABATH. Where it would be feasible and to the advantage of the Government I believe that we should own our own quarters. Although right here, notwithstanding the tremendous building program in the last 8 years, we are still paying over \$5,000,000 rental annually, and I feel that the same accommodations could be obtained elsewhere for about \$2,500,000. But that is only a small amount, really a drop in the bucket, of what could be saved through relocation.

Now, as to the permanency: If it could be demonstrated that the work could be performed more economically and to the best advantage of the taxpayers of the country, why, they should remain. But if that were not established, then let us move them back when conditions will have improved here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. SABATH, in your opinion, do you have adequate facilities in Chicago now that if some of these departments of the Government should be moved there it would not be necessary for Chicago to come before the Congress asking for an appropriation for houses?

Mr. SABATH. I have a report from the national board of real-estate agents showing that there are 45,000 vacant apartments and flats available now to the people if they should be transferred to Chicago.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that this report [indicating]?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I think it is. I have a bigger report, but unfortunately I did not bring it with me.

Now in addition to the agencies that I have mentioned there is, in the Department of the Interior, the General Land Office and Geological Survey.

In the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Chemistry and Sells, Marketing, Dairy Industry, Plant Industry, Animal Husbandry, Soil Conservation, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

And in the Labor Department there are a half dozen bureaus that could be transferred elsewhere.

In the Department of Labor there are half a dozen bureaus that could be transferred out there, and we could find many of them, even in the Treasury Department. Many of them could be removed. My colleague, Mr. DIRKSEN, is continuously harping upon the subject of transferring the Interstate Commerce Commission, and I think he is right, because it is a separate, independent bureau. They have no real business here, and most of the work is being done elsewhere. The hearings, or most of them, are being held in Chicago. I notice that the Speaker of the House, who was formerly chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, would not favor that. That is because he is wedded to that Department, having been chairman of that committee for so many years. If that could be done, and the hearings and other business of the Commission handled in Chicago, it would save the people interested, the shippers, etc., probably a million dollars.

Mr. HARRIS. You are referring to the Interstate Commerce Commission rather than the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, are you not?

Mr. SABATH. I was simply restating what my colleague [Mr. DIRKSEN] had said.

Mr. HARRIS. You were referring to the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. SABATH, have you taken into consideration that if we have these departments in various buildings throughout the United States, and the heads and other representatives of the department were called before congressional committees for information, or for hearings, they would have to come here from those distant points, and the expenses would be borne by the Federal Government?

Mr. SABATH. May I say this: I said several bureaus or agencies of the departments. They would not be called before any committees.

Mr. ELLIOTT. You mentioned the Department of the Interior.

Mr. SABATH. As a rule, we call in the Secretary or Assistant Secretary or some official in charge.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I differ from you on that. I happen to be a member of the Public Lands Committee, and frequently we have four or five representatives of bureaus of the Department to come before the committee in reference to bills for rights-of-way, parks, and so forth. They come before the committee to testify.

Mr. SABATH. Before the Public Lands Committee?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand it, you are not advocating the wholesale removal of departments, but simply some of the agencies.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; some bureaus that could be transferred to other places, where their work could be done as well as here. Then we will start to practice some economy, and,

not only that, but at the same time we will be relieving the overcrowded conditions here.

The CHAIRMAN. I might say for your information that we have proposals before this committee right now to provide additional housing in Washington for Government workers. Now, if this housing is available elsewhere, and if some of these agencies that have their real functions elsewhere moved, of course, that might obviate the necessity and expense of providing houses for Government workers here.

Mr. SABATH. I want to call attention to one other fact, to which I have alluded: You have already, through this committee, had passed through the House two appropriation bills, or authorization bills, amounting to \$300,000,000. Now, that is for what? It is for the housing of Federal employees in new locations. If these plants or establishments are located a little nearer large cities like Chicago, then we would not have been obliged to spend this \$300,000,000 for new housing.

Mr. MCGREGOR. You do not want a powder plant in Chicago, do you?

Mr. SABATH. No; we do not. No one would want to have a powder plant within 35 or 40 miles of any town, but we do feel that manufacturing plants could be located where you could obtain labor and the necessary facilities. I grant you that there would be no justification for the establishment of a powder plant in a large city. Such activities should not be located near any great community, but that should be out in the States somewhere away from everybody. That is true for many reasons. Now, we have in Chicago many small plants manufacturing tools and all kinds of needs for the Government, but, unfortunately, that work goes to the very largest manufacturers in New England and other places. All of our section, including Chicago, unfortunately has been ignored. That is the reason for these vacancies in Chicago.

May I add this as to the values: When we made an investigation in 1934 and 1935 of the value of property, bonds, vacancies, etc., we found in Washington at that time that the bonds on most of the hotels and apartment buildings here were selling for 2, 3, and 5 cents on the dollar. That was also true in most of the other cities. After we started to make the investigation of these so-called protective committees there was a change. That was a misnomer, of course, because they were no more protective committees than I am an angel. Now, the bonds on those properties in the District of Columbia have gone up as high as 108. Bond values also increased in New York, Chicago, St. Louis, Kansas City, and in other places, from 2, 5, or 7 cents, up to 25, 30, or 40 cents on the dollar. Many that were forced to be turned over to the bondholders are worth now 100 cents on the dollar. In the city of Chicago, unfortunately, the price has gone down until now it is down to about 18 or 20 cents on the dollar. The loss to the people in their investments in those properties all over the United States was tremendous. They involved from twenty to thirty billion dollars of stocks and securities.

Now, we should look at this from a broad point of view. Why should the city of Washington and the District of Columbia have all the advantages and all the benefits that they enjoy? With it all, they are never satisfied. When we tried to put on a fair tax here, you will recall what a hue and cry they raised, claiming that they were unfair and unjust, when we know that the taxes here on real estate and personal property have been running 50 percent less than the taxes in other cities and in other locations.

I am going to ask you to put some of these figures in your record. In view of Mr. DIRKSEN's statement as to the cost of transportation, I am not going to put those figures in, but I will give you a few reports. For in-

stance, I have a statement of the rentals paid here by departments and agencies. I have them separated.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to have that statement in the record.

(Said statement is as follows:)

<i>Rentals by departments and agencies</i>	
Departments:	
Commerce.....	\$236,865.85
Interior.....	132,740.84
Justice.....	145,727.64
Navy.....	3,096.00
Labor.....	38,480.45
Agriculture.....	384,071.71
War.....	101,249.20
Navy.....	71,146.00
State.....	41,109.55
Treasury.....	352,974.99
Agencies:	
Civilian Conservation Corps.....	20,748.00
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	6,381.00
National Labor Relations Board.....	90,546.84
Alley Dwellings Authority, District of Columbia.....	1,800.00
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	460,000.00
Veterans' Administration.....	54,588.00
National Youth Administration, District of Columbia.....	13,400.00
Council of Personnel Administration.....	4,800.00
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	201,090.00
Federal Works Agency.....	184,555.84
Federal Security Agency.....	449,618.96
Railroad Retirement Board, District of Columbia Selective Service.....	9,728.00
Federal Housing Administration.....	153,665.68
U. S. Civil Service Commission.....	168,985.74
U. S. Employees' Compensation Commission.....	84,248.28
U. S. Maritime Commission.....	90,757.71
Public Roads Administration.....	50,326.90
General Accounting Office.....	252,073.46
Home Owners' Loan Corporation.....	3,291.00
Executive Office of President—Government Reports.....	51,751.28
Executive Office of President—Office for Emergency Management.....	38,350.32
Federal Communications Commission.....	27,506.55
Federal Power Commission.....	98,121.00
Rural Electrification Administration.....	2,053.44
Immigration and Naturalization.....	40,295.72
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	180,807.76
Insolvent national banks.....	5,100.00
Commodity Credit Corporation.....	11,000.04
Weather Bureau.....	6,150.00
White House garage.....	7,500.00
Railroad Retirement Board.....	227,101.72
Panama Canal.....	24,300.00
Government Printing Office.....	12,000.00
Library for the Blind.....	5,779.99
Total.....	3,277,914.95

¹ Total, 201 buildings; annual rents paid by Government in Washington, \$5,054,000.

Mr. SABATH. I also have a list of the bureaus and agencies that I think could be transferred to advantage.

Mr. HARRIS. Does that include the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to have that statement in the record.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

"I feel that many of the bureaus and agencies in the interest of economy and efficiency should be transferred. Naturally I am interested in Chicago, but some of these bureaus and agencies can be advantageously transferred to other cities:

"Treasury: Bureau of Customs to New York; Bureau of the Mint to Philadelphia.

"I do not expect the transfer of any bureau or division of the War Department, State Department, or Navy Department.

"Interior: General Land Office, Geological Survey, Park Service, Grazing Service, Indian Affairs, Reclamation Service, Bureau of Mines, Fish and Wildlife Division, Alcohol Tax Unit.

"Agriculture: Bureau of Chemistry, Marketing Service, Dairy Industry, Plant Industry, Bureau of Agriculture Economics, Animal Industry, Forest Service, Surplus Marketing Service.

"Labor Department: Wage and Hour Division, Children's Bureau, Soil Conservation, Women's Bureau.

"Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

"Home Loan Bank Board.

"United States Office of Education.

"National Youth Administration.

"Food and Drug Administration.

"Railroad Retirement.

"Tennessee Valley Administration.

"Veterans' Administration."

Mr. SABATH. I have here many resolutions and letters, but I do not want to encumber your hearings with them. I have a resolution from the National Real Estate Association.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that a representative of that association wants to appear during the hearings, and he will probably give all that information.

Mr. SABATH. Then, I will forego that. I will let him do it himself. I do not want to take anybody's material away from him.

In conclusion, I hope that your committee will actually go into this needed relief.

The CHAIRMAN. We want to do that, and we will appreciate very much your counsel and advice all through the hearings.

Mr. SABATH. This is the first time in 32 years, that I have taken any interest in these District conditions. I do not want to be unfair to them, but the conditions are intolerable. We owe something to ourselves and the people we represent. Something must be done and should be done because we are going to increase the personnel here. Where we will stop, I do not know. If the War Department would exercise a little better judgment, these plants would not be so unfairly located. Many of the plants are right around here. We are building some plants close by Washington, and I do not think that is justifiable.

Mr. MCGREGOR. As I understand, you criticized the location of certain industries.

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Why do you think they were put in those particular localities, or what were the predominant factors that caused them to be placed in those localities? Do you think it was politics?

Mr. SABATH. I do not know. As you know, military gentlemen do not play politics as we understand it. They play their own politics, and do not pay any attention to you or me. They do not pay any attention to ordinary Representatives and Senators. They are above us. They know more about it, and take their own viewpoint. Perhaps there might have been some influence somewhere on the part of some people whom they knew, but it was not the influence of Senators or Representatives.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Do you mean some people they know at the other end of the Avenue?

Mr. SABATH. I will tell you what I have in mind: We have several hundred men who have resigned or who are out of the service

now, and they are very familiar with all the men in charge of these things. They live in various sections, and they may have had reason to recommend some places to their friends with whom they had served in their official capacity. I know this, that they have been employed by many corporations, although they are still on the retired list and drawing splendid retirement pay. Yet they are now employed by great corporations here and there. That is for what purpose? It is because they know the gentlemen inside the War Department and Navy Department.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a violation of law for a man on the retired list of the Army to place Army orders or contracts for other parties?

Mr. SABATH. I do not know. We have tried once or twice to restrict that. When they do it, I think they should be taken off the retired list. They should be taken off the retired list when they accept salaries and compensation for services to private industries.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it a fact that the general policy has been laid down with regard to the selection of locations for defense plants? For example, it has been announced publicly that it has been the policy to locate powder plants far in the interior so they would be safe in the event of an attack on the seaboard.

Mr. SABATH. That may have been; yes. Now, when they locate these plants in areas so far removed from the cities, you are obliged to build for them housing facilities, roads, provide electricity, and everything else; whereas if they were a little closer to some cities they would not have to provide all those facilities. I do not mean by that powder plants, but other plants could have been located closer to the cities. Then it would not be necessary to spend such tremendous sums for houses and roads. I think that millions of dollars could have been saved in that way.

Mr. HARRIS. We have been told in this committee within the past few days by gentlemen representing these Government agencies that in the selection of sites for all new plants all of those factors that you have mentioned were taken into consideration before any decision was reached.

Mr. SABATH. Perhaps when they reached the middle section of the country, around Chicago, their eyesight failed them.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Do you not think, if we want real economy, that it would be a mistake to go into any large congested area at the present time and start a new program, or to move a Government building to Detroit, Chicago, or a large city like that, where they have a great traffic problem? Would it not be more in the interest of economy to move to an area that is not so congested? I get your viewpoint. You are talking from the angle of Chicago, and I am talking from the angle of economy. It is time that the Members of Congress gave some thought to the tremendous cost that is piling up daily and that must be met by the taxpayers. I am interested in economy. I do not care where you move any Government agency, whether to Chicago or any other place, but we must take into consideration, in connection with any moving plans or location of plants, how much it will cost to move the families of the workers on the program. I am looking at it from the economy angle. We are spending money blindly every day, and every Member of Congress is responsible for it. As one Member, I am getting sick and tired of people coming in with programs, all wrapped up like a hot sandwich, calling on the taxpayers to foot the cost. We will have to cut down on it, because we are spending far more than we have.

Mr. SABATH. I do not know whether you were here when I made my first statement. I said that it is not only Chicago that is to be taken into consideration, but that in the main we should take into consideration the question of economy, the question of cost, and also the question of feasibility. Now, I believe

that if you establish new centers, you would be obliged to spend a lot of money for buildings, roads, electrical plants, and everything else, whereas in these other localities I have referred to you already have them provided. You have them near Chicago, you have them near St. Louis, and near Kansas City, as well as many other places. In those places those facilities are already in existence, and you would not have to build anything.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I have heard that all my life, but when you go into it you may find that the cost is the same or more. I am looking at it from the economy angle.

Mr. SABATH. We have in most of the cities available space, so it would not be necessary to build.

Mr. ELLIOTT. You have a suburb of Chicago called La Grange, where they have electric power and all those facilities. The Government came along, and some personnel of the Navy is stationed there. I know that in one case they are paying \$40 for one single room. I have just come from there a week ago. It is occupied by my own daughter, her husband being a Navy man.

Mr. SABATH. That is because it is in a little select residential place about 22 miles from Chicago. I could give you 10 locations within 12 miles of the heart of the city where there are plenty of available quarters for them, and where they could obtain living quarters for from \$20 to \$25 or \$30.

The CHAIRMAN. We certainly thank you, Judge SABATH, and appreciate very much your statement.

Mr. SABATH. I thank you, gentlemen, and I hope you will continue and use your best judgment in seeing whether these conditions here can be relieved, and whether the Government could be saved money by your action in this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. We have here some reports from various departments, which were requested in the resolution, but we will defer reading them or incorporating them in the record at this time.

(Thereupon the committee proceeded to the consideration of other business.)

Mr. Speaker, I greatly regret that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds could not see its way clear at that time to favorably consider and report my resolution. I feel that if action had been had on the resolution then it would not have been necessary to expend the sum provided in this bill for housing in the District of Columbia. However, I appreciate that the President, realizing the seriousness of the congested conditions in Washington and that overcrowded conditions would increase, without the recommendation of the committee, has acted by issuing an Executive order authorizing the removal and transfer of some of the bureaus and agencies. I feel that additional bureaus and agencies should be removed from the District of Columbia to make room for the ever-increasing activities of the Army and Navy.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, there is no opposition to the rule. I believe there is no opposition in the House to the passage of the bill.

The bill provides an authorization of \$50,000,000 to alleviate the housing con-

ditions in Washington as a result of the war. It is estimated that 50,000 new employees will come into Washington some time during the year. At the present time everyone knows we are faced with overcrowded conditions. No rooms are available. The purpose of the bill is to build immediately temporary housing, if necessary, to take care of 50,000 workers.

The bill also provides for enlarged facilities for hospitals, for water supplies, and perhaps for communications. This bill should have immediate action because it is necessary. It is a defense measure necessary to take care of the overcrowded conditions, and I hope the bill will pass immediately.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

EMERGENCY HOUSING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6483) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6483) amending the act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, with Mr. BROWN of Georgia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use, and I do this for the purpose of making a brief preliminary statement in paying tribute to the members of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds for the very zealous and diligent way in which they have given consideration to this entire national problem of defense housing and public works necessary for service to such housing in the congested areas of this country. Our committee has never approached these matters from a partisan standpoint. As loyal Americans we have sought to do our duty.

I am glad to say, Mr. Chairman, that this bill comes before the House today with the unanimous report of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds after very extensive hearings and investigation of various matters concerned in the pending measure.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Has the gentleman's committee made its final report on the housing projects that have been constructed heretofore?

Mr. LANHAM. No; the committee has not yet made its final report which it is required to make some time during this Congress. It has, however, made very extensive investigations; and I may say further that this committee has been

very active and diligent in trying to see that the law is administered in accordance with its terms and provisions.

Mr. RICH. I am not so much interested in the housing units that have already been constructed as I am in those about to be constructed, because we do not want to see repeated some of the foolish extravagances that up to a short time ago wasted so many of the hard-earned dollars of the American taxpayers. I express the hope that the gentleman's committee through its report and action will see that such maladministration by those in charge of the housing program are not repeated.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that by amendment of this act we have obviated a great many of the mistakes that have heretofore been made. The Administration now seems to be upon a very sound and logical basis. I am glad to make this report to the Congress.

Mr. RICH. We have every confidence in the chairman of the committee, and we hope nothing will happen in the future like what has happened in some of the housing projects in the past where the waste was so terrible. We should not permit it to go on in new projects.

Mr. LANHAM. I take pleasure in assuring the gentleman that those conditions have been corrected, and I do not believe they will be repeated in the future.

Mr. RICH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, as has been stated, this is a bill to provide housing for this great emergency within the District of Columbia and its environs. At the time it became apparent that America might become involved in the conflict that was raging on other continents we had the mightiest industrial organization of any country in the world, but it was an organization devoted to peacetime purposes. It became necessary in order to transfer the strength of that vast organization over to wartime purposes to build great factories, erect great plants in various locations over the United States where none had existed before. This necessitated the moving of great numbers of people to new localities where no housing existed. The needs in other parts of the country were taken care of by acts passed heretofore by the Congress. At the time those needs were considered it was felt that the District of Columbia and its environs presented a separate problem. The committee felt we should have further hearings and go into the problems confronting the District from the standpoint of housing and facilities; therefore the bill that is now under consideration, which is an amendment to the original act, has been considered very carefully, and we bring it to you today with the unanimous report of the committee.

During the hearings upon this bill a subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia sat with us and gave their advice and consideration in connection with the committee which brought forth the bill. In the hearings we also

asked representatives from the District Government, the Commissioners, to appear. They appeared and gave their advice and testimony regarding the needs of the District.

It was found that the utilities of the District had gotten to the point where expansion could not be made so far as housing is concerned without further expanding water mains, sewers, garbage disposal, and so forth. It was found that our school system would have to be expanded to take care of the many thousands of new school children who would be coming into the District. It is known to everyone here that many thousands of people have come into the District within the last year or two. Additional thousands—I understand at least 40,000 additional employees—will be called to the District within the next 2 or 3 months. There are no houses and no rooms in which to house these people.

Washington today is the war capital of the world. Our Allies have sent thousands of people into this city. Buildings have been provided for their use. Houses have been provided for those who are working on behalf of those Allies. It is necessary, if our great war effort is to continue, that housing be provided in the shortest possible length of time. It is just as necessary to draw plans for a building or to draw plans for a road or for a plant, or to contract for the doing of any of this work that we have office workers here in Washington and executives here to do the planning and to do the book work in connection with it as it is to have someone out in the field to handle the pick, the shovel, and build the buildings, and do the actual work in the factories. As a matter of fact, none of that work can be done except after the book work in Washington has been done. I do not need to argue further that point. Those are the reasons, known to all of us, why this bill should pass promptly.

In the consideration of this matter it was the desire of the committee and I think of everyone who appeared before the committee to require that private industry do as large a part of this work as it is humanly possible for it to do, but under the conditions confronting us it is not possible for private industry to take care of this situation within the length of time we must have this additional housing and these additional facilities; therefore, upon the recommendations that were presented to the committee by the proper authorities, and after complete investigation, the committee is recommending the sum of \$50,000,000 for the purpose of building these facilities and constructing the buildings.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman explain to us what provisions have been made in this bill to aid in hospitalization in Washington?

Mr. BELL. Provision has been made for additional hospitalization.

Mr. STEFAN. What happens to George Washington Hospital, that has been doing a very good work, and other hospitals? Will they be benefited by this bill in any way, shape, or form?

Mr. BELL. That is an administrative matter. The bill is broad enough to provide for hospitalization. Those matters will be worked out by the Director of the Federal Works Agency.

Mr. STEFAN. But in the matter of housing generally in the District, that the gentleman has so ably explained, there is some provision to assist in the work of extending hospitalization facilities?

Mr. BELL. That is correct. Hospitals, schools, roads, streets, sewers, sewage disposal, and any other necessary public works are taken care of. In other words, the committee felt that the details are matters of administrative responsibility, but the bill is broad enough to provide for the normal and natural things which go with this sudden and vast expansion.

Mr. Chairman, those are the only things I care to comment upon at this time.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. What disposition will be made of all these buildings which are now being constructed during the emergency when the inevitable exodus of people from Washington takes place some day?

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to the gentleman from Idaho that this act from its very beginning has been based upon the proposition of recouping for the Federal Government as much of the expenditure as may be possible. The building that is now contemplated here is primarily temporary in character, of a dormitory nature, largely for the unmarried workers. By placing them in dormitories the transportation system is relieved and they have opportunity for association, and the construction can be done more cheaply. This bill, of course, provides for the Washington metropolitan area. The surrounding territory of Maryland and Virginia, for instance, can be used, and it is our purpose with reference to construction under this particular act to recoup for the Government all the money possible.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, late yesterday afternoon the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKEOUGH] obtained recognition from the Speaker and addressed the House of Representatives.

He read in its entirety an editorial appearing in the Chicago Daily Tribune on February 9. The editorial was

written because of the death of Pvt. Richard Graff, member for 11 years of the Tribune staff, who lost his life fighting with General MacArthur in the Philippines. It commented on the sacrifice made by this young man and made reference to the fact that there were others who in the past have been most vociferous in their eagerness for war but who are now safely placed in secure positions far away from the shots and shells and machine guns and tanks and submarines.

Mr. Chairman, we all know that those things exist. They existed in the last World War and in all the wars that preceded it. I do not know whether the editorial referred to any particular individuals or not. If so, they were not mentioned by name.

The gentleman from Illinois seems to have taken violent exception to the editorial in question. Had he confined his remarks to a censure of the Chicago Tribune or its policies, or even its patriotism, he would have been well within legitimate bounds. Everyone recognizes that a newspaper must stand on its own feet and that its policies are always subject to criticism as well as commendation. But the gentleman from Illinois went far beyond those bounds and launched with a bitter personal attack on the Tribune's editor, Col. Robert R. McCormick. He challenged the patriotism of the colonel and charged him with being a traitor to his country. I sincerely regret that the gentleman from Illinois so forgot himself as to go to those extremes. Colonel McCormick lives about a mile and a half from my home. I know him as a citizen of my county and State, but I also know him as a neighbor. I know that his patriotism and love of country is just as intense, just as true, just as loyal as is mine, or as is that of the gentleman who attacked him.

Colonel McCormick's activities have not been confined to civic affairs and newspaper work. He served his country in its armed forces in 1916 and 1917 on the Mexican border. During World War No. 1 he was attached to General Pershing's staff in France; was major of the Fifth Field Artillery; and it was while thus serving that he participated in the first action in which United States troops were involved at Cantigny. Later he became adjutant of the Fifty-seventh Artillery Brigade; lieutenant colonel, One Hundred and Twenty-second Field Artillery, and colonel of the Sixty-first Field Artillery. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal. Hardly the type of citizen against whom the charge of disloyalty and treason will apply.

I am not informed as to the record of the gentleman from Illinois during that period. Perhaps it is just as brilliant. I do not challenge his patriotism, nor that of any man or woman in this House. I do challenge his wisdom and regret that he has permitted bias and prejudice to warp his usual sound judgment. Colonel McCormick has lived in Illinois too long, his record is too well known, his activities are too well publicized for any thinking person to be deluded into presuming even for a moment that his has

been anything but a career of outstanding American loyalty.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The fact that Colonel McCormick was made a member of General Pershing's staff during the war, that he was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, and that he was both a lieutenant colonel and a colonel should be sufficient proof that Colonel McCormick is a fine, loyal, and understanding American citizen.

Mr. REED of Illinois. There is no question about it. The official citation awarding Colonel McCormick the Distinguished Service Medal states that he displayed rare leadership and organizing ability, unusual executive ability, and sound technical judgment, and that by his ceaseless energy and his close supervision of training, discipline, and command in action against the enemy he contributed materially to the successful operations of the Artillery of the American Expeditionary Forces.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As a newspaper publisher, I am interested in what the gentleman has said. Is not this attack against Colonel McCormick more or less predicated on the fact that he has dared to offer constructive criticism during this particular period?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I think it was Danton who said, "Dare, dare again, always dare."

Colonel McCormick is a man who dares to think and dares to print what he thinks.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If we have reached the place in this country where we cannot have constructive criticism, then are we not in danger?

Mr. REED of Illinois. The gentleman is correct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of this measure in the hearings, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds had the able collaboration of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia and other members of his committee. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply appreciative of the very gracious remarks which were extended to the Committee on the District of Columbia by the able chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of this body. We were privileged to join with that committee in the consideration of the problem of providing proper housing for defense workers who have already come and will continue to come to the National Capital

during what we trust will be a successful prosecution of the war effort from the standpoint of those persons charged with direction of the program which is made here.

I simply wish to state just a few facts and make just a few observations on this subject. Although the debate today will perhaps not be lengthy, there seems to be a general agreement on the merits of the bill, and the hearings were exhaustive. There came before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds individuals who are conversant with this problem. They set out in a lucid and clear manner the facts and the problems as we find them in connection with housing and other utilities and facilities that are needed in our war effort in this area at this time.

I think we should be very frank with ourselves and realize that Washington is not the slow-moving city of peacetime days. The tempo of life has been greatly stepped up with wartime. We had a Capital in peacetimes where there were 100,000 workers in all of our governmental agencies in Washington. This figure would, perhaps, apply to 1937. There are individuals who, of course, would say that we have had too many governmental workers who have come into the District of Columbia. There are 2 schools of thought on this subject, those who believe we should have a decentralization of our agencies in peacetime rather than just, perhaps, in wartimes when it is necessary to make way for the thousands of defense workers who come here. There are those who believe we can have a better national effort by having centralized at the Capital the agencies of government. I personally feel that certain work can be carried on with efficiency in communities other than in this city. I am not going into that subject at this time except to say that now we are faced with a reality. We are building within this city another city. In other words, it is estimated that within the next 11 months, or possibly 10 months, there will come to Washington, D. C., and suburbs, approximately 85,000 men and women who are to be employed in defense positions. Some of the men and women in the group of 12,000 who have been ordered transferred and are now in process of being transferred to other cities who are employed in nondefense agencies, will not follow the agency into the community to which the transfer is made. This means that there is a certain worker reservoir which will go into the defense agencies as they build here in Washington. It does not matter which way the picture develops, the jobs must be filled.

This means we will have approximately 200,000 additional men, women, and children who will be living in the District of Columbia and nearby for the duration of this war. How shall we care for this city within a city? It can only be done by having, of course, the office facilities for the conduct of the work itself. We must give attention and prompt attention, which this committee and the Congress is doing today, to providing the necessary housing for the individuals who work in defense agencies, and in many cases for the families of these workers.

This means also that we have to have the necessary utilities which accompany a great effort like this.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia 3 additional minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. We must provide the facilities to carry on not only the natural functions of this city but also the functions which will increase because of the war effort.

We know that there are transportation problems in Washington which must be solved if we are to get defense workers to and from their homes or to their places of activity. We know also that the hospitals in the District of Columbia are greatly overcrowded, and testimony before the District of Columbia Committee indicates that there is a need for between 1,000 and 1,500 additional beds in the public and private hospitals within this jurisdiction. Obstetrical beds are needed especially at this time as we have heard from witnesses who appeared before both the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee and the District of Columbia Committee with respect to this subject.

Of course, these necessary accommodations must be provided out of the \$50,000,000 set up in this housing bill. It is proposed that the needs of this community, from the standpoint of facilities and also for these various services, be given certain funds.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. In view of the reports we have been getting through the press today with respect to the situation in the Pacific, does not the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia feel that we must economize on some of these things at home in order that we may provide the equipment and supplies which are necessary to win this war?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am in full agreement with the gentleman from Indiana, and if I know the truth about the number of employees that are needed I will attempt always to join with the gentleman in putting on the pay roll just the necessary number of persons and cut to the bone our expenditures for office workers. We are told, however, by those who prosecute the war effort that it is necessary under the centralization for the direction of the war from the standpoint of Washington, D. C., that this is necessary in carrying into effect the successful prosecution of the war at the fighting front. I am only relying, of course, as is the distinguished gentleman from Texas, on the hearings before his committee and the District of Columbia Committee, on the information brought to us by these leaders of our defense agencies. The Army Air Corps itself is asking in Washington, D. C., for 1,450,000 square feet of space.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. We are told this is necessary and, of course, we must rely

on the information now which is given to us.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I was attending the hearings of another committee the other day, and it developed there that the average expense of this defense housing program for engineering and architectural fees and that sort of thing was running 14 percent. I hope there is going to be some different operation here, because that is certainly disgusting. I think the United States Housing Authority is largely responsible for it, but that is an absolutely ridiculous setup and I could not subscribe to it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am sure that the gentleman could not subscribe to it. Also, I cannot subscribe to inefficiency in the transaction of this war business at home. I join the gentleman from New York and trust that the Congress will use every method at its disposal to bring the most careful scrutiny of all of the dollars that are spent in the war effort of this country.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Certainly.

Mr. HAINES. In respect to what the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has said, I agree with him in expressing my disapproval of these large expenditures of money for architectural and engineering fees. Does not the gentleman believe that there are plenty of architects and engineers available whose fees would not exceed 5 or 7 percent?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think there should be a profit which is reasonable. Especially in wartime should the profit be smaller than at other times.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more. If the gentleman will permit, the act itself which is applicable to this title provides that in negotiated contracts, and most of them are negotiated contracts, there shall not be in excess of 6 percent, and I am inclined to think that if any such fees have been paid that they are certainly beyond the contemplation and intent of the law, because we have by terms stipulated a restriction in that regard, and I may say furthermore that in the reorganization of the Federal Works Agency a great many of the things that we have been complaining about have been eliminated, and I think that assurance can be given that if the situation to which the gentleman from New York referred has existed, there will not be a recurrence of it.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will permit, where you are building a great lot of houses of largely the same type, the engineering and architectural expense ought to be a good deal less than it would be on an individual house that was built to individual design.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Of course, mass production should cut down the cost.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, of course I have a great deal of confidence

in the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], and I spoke to him about this matter before. What I want particularly to inquire of the gentleman from West Virginia is to know whether or not these houses are to be constructed only in the District of Columbia.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say that the bill provides for this metropolitan area. A great many will be constructed necessarily in Maryland and Virginia. For instance, we are building a new War Department over across the river in Virginia, and it will relieve the traffic situation very much in the District of Columbia proper, in the business district, the governmental center, if houses are built over there to accommodate as many of the employees as possible. This does not provide for the District of Columbia. Furthermore, it is not primarily a District of Columbia matter. It is a situation which has been brought upon this general area by more activities. The District of Columbia, as I say, is not to profit to any extent through the enactment of this measure. Necessarily, we will have to expend and extend some of the facilities of the District of Columbia, for instance, with reference to fire protection and with reference to water and sanitation, and so forth, but this is not primarily a District of Columbia bill. It is to look after this metropolitan-area housing and necessary public works by reason of this great influx of population into the city of Washington. If the gentleman will peruse the hearings, he will see that private capital is doing a great deal of this building. Another considerable part of it is being done under the temporary-shelter fund, and I think the gentleman can rest assured that great care in respect to expense, and so forth, will be taken in the operation of this law.

Mr. HAINES. I have sufficient confidence in the gentleman from Texas to believe everything that he tells me. I would like to comment by saying that back in York, Pa., where I come from, we have this same problem of housing because of the great amount of national defense activities.

I induced the real-estate men and builders to get together, and they assured me that there was no need for the Government to come there and erect a lot of houses that would be some "hot potatoes" on their hands after it was all over. As a result of that conference the builders and real-estate men got together, and they are building a lot of houses and taking care of the situation.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is one of the distinguished leaders whom we consider as mayor of the city of Washington. In connection with the defense program they need a lot of extra space for office buildings. They are building scores of new buildings to house war activities. What does the gentleman think about the idea of using the National Art Gallery, the Corcoran Art Gallery, and some of these

other art galleries where there are thousands of square feet of space that could be used for war activities, and they could put these art treasures away for a while?

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. The matter of office space is not concerned with the present legislation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I recognize that.

Mr. LANHAM. And the funds for it do not come out of appropriations authorized by this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has again expired.

Mr. LANHAM. I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I believe in art and culture. It is a good thing for the country, but as we read in the press and in the war communiques, we are in difficulties today. If we need this extra space we should use the available space and save the money and let them store the art treasures until the emergency is over.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In general, I am in agreement with the gentleman from Minnesota. Our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who is ranking member of the House District of Columbia Committee, a few days ago made what I believe to be a very sound proposal. He asked that certain space in the District of Columbia, which we understand generally as the Mall, should be turned over for parking during the emergency. The gentleman from Illinois believes in culture and beauty, as does the gentleman from Minnesota, but we face a reality. We face a need from the standpoint of necessary office space, to which the gentleman directs attention.

I would like to say to the members of the committee that profiteering on any phase of the defense effort is reprehensible. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], chairman of the committee, has well said that these profits are being pared down to what is right. I am sure we can trust the scrutiny of the gentleman from Texas and others as the housing program applies to Washington, D. C. Let us pass this bill, because it is needed. We do not know how long we will be able to carry the increased load in the District of Columbia and the metropolitan area, due to the influx of these workers. We do not want a break-down of our health in the District of Columbia, or of our transportation or of our housing facilities. I believe this Congress, recognizing the fact, will give speedy approval to this measure.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, first let me express my complete approbation

of the method to be employed in the building of these houses. Answering the observation made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I think, if there is any agency in the Government that will exercise care and caution in preventing exorbitant architectural and engineering fees, it will be the Federal Works Agency. I have had some recent experience with them and so have some of my constituents. They have sharpened their pencils. They are holding the expenses down. Along with it I think they are doing a very efficient job. So the fact that they are charged with the responsibility of carrying out this program is heartening and encouraging.

I want to say a word about parking. If we are going to bring in 40,000, 50,000, 60,000, or 80,000 additional people, equipped with vehicles of one kind and another, it only means we are going to add to the congestion in the United States Capital. Finally we reach that stage of traffic proceeding where it is akin to forcing 24 square inches of smoke into a chimney that is only 18 inches square. It just cannot be done. So some provision must be made along that line.

The District of Columbia Committee has given some attention to it. I made a suggestion on Monday morning of this week to take that portion of the Mall that is bounded on the east by Third Street NW., on the west by Fourteenth Street, on the south by Jefferson Place, and on the north by Madison Place, which is more familiarly known to the Members as that open area that extends from the Grant Monument, just below the Capitol, in the direction of the Washington Monument, and convert it into a parking area. At the rate of 200 square feet per vehicle, which would be sufficient, that probably will accommodate 20,000 vehicles. It is under the direction of the Department of the Interior and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. I do not yield to Mr. Delano or to Mr. Settle in my interest in the esthetic and cultural aspects of the Nation's Capital. As a member of the District of Columbia Committee and one who has served as a member of that committee for the past 9 or more years, I have undertaken to do my little bit to beautify and keep beautiful this Capital, because of the great many people who come here from one end of the year to the other. They want to be impressed. This is the Nation's Capital. It belongs to all the people in all the States of the Nation; and truly it should be a lovely spot; but we are in war, and Mr. Settle and Mr. Delano should not forget that we are in war and that sacrifices should be made. It would be easy to lift the sod, or leave the sod there and cover it with gravel, and turn that long esplanade into parking space to accommodate some 20,000 cars. I think it is absolutely imperative at the present time, and I propose to work out some kind of measure that will compel that kind of action. If necessary, I shall see whether it cannot be done under the defense powers of the President.

Let me tell you the effect of the congestion of traffic problems upon the personnel in the District of Columbia. There is developing here a very interesting game which, from want of anything else, we will call checkers. An employee parks his car on Constitution Avenue, then goes to his job in one of the buildings in the Federal Triangle. He watches the clock religiously to make sure that at the end of an hour and a half he will get back there to move his car, because it will have a chalk mark on it placed there by a traffic policeman. Then he will, if possible, by arrangement with somebody else, try to find a new spot or otherwise he will move it in the next block. Then he goes back to his job, but at the end of another hour and a half he will be back there to move his car again. By four well-timed movings he can keep his car parked on the streets and avoid a traffic ticket. It has been conservatively estimated that there are 10,000 hours of time wasted by employees moving their cars. Think of what this means in work accomplished, and especially in the interruption sustained in attention to public duty. That does not make him a very efficient public servant. Calculated in dollars and cents, it is an enormous waste of money.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Illinois 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can readily understand people driving in from all sections of Washington, Virginia, and Maryland, unable to find parking space, unable to find a space on one of the parking lots down the Avenue, having of necessity to go out and move their cars three, four, or five times. Here you have really a serious traffic problem. It indicates that the matter of finding a remedy for our parking trouble is very imperative at the present time. I sincerely hope that the Secretary of the Interior and the National Park and Planning Commission will remember that we are engaged in the prosecution of a war at the present time and that some of these aesthetic concepts must go for the time being, for this land I have indicated affords one of the most ideal parking areas in the Nation's Capital. It is within a block of most of the buildings in the Federal Triangle. The Federal Trade Commission, Internal Revenue, Interstate Commerce Commission, the Maritime Commission, the Department of Labor, the Department of Justice, and others could utilize this area. Those employed there would be just a block from their work and at the same time we will relieve the parking problem on Constitution Avenue.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is always an exponent of realism. We can agree with him that in peacetime we think of this Capital as the Capital of beauty; but this is wartime, as the gentleman well says, and we shall have to realize that it is the pivotal point of our civilian effort toward the successful prosecution of the war.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My friend from West Virginia is eminently correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The suggestion of my friend from Illinois is founded on exactly the same basis as my suggestion to use the National Art Gallery and these other art institutes for purposes of the War Department.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to my friend from Minnesota that as long as 2 years ago when I first launched a crusade to decentralize Government activities the only answer I got was a polite cheer. The President was bold enough and far-seeing enough last month to order certain agencies out of Washington, and he had the courage to stand by that order. I express the hope that he will send other nondefense agencies from Washington whose presence in Washington is not essential and whose functions can be discharged at some point closer to their base load. This would relieve some of the congestion we face at the present time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman is proposing a plan to turn these parks around the Capital into parking lots for automobiles?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If we had as much space around here as the gentleman does in Idaho, we would have no trouble.

Mr. WHITE. Has the gentleman considered the terrible conditions said to exist in Southwest Washington, not far from the Capitol Building? We read in the metropolitan press that those slum areas are of such character that the uniformed forces coming to the District of Columbia are forbidden to go into them singly, that these are black-out districts, forbidden districts? What about cleaning up that mess and using that area for parking instead of disfiguring our beautiful park system?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the gentleman from Idaho that there are two approaches to the problem: First, through the Alley Dwelling Authority of the Nation's Capital, which has authority for slum clearance; and, secondly, by the fringe-parking bill, which is now at the White House. The latter measure makes it possible for the District Commissioners to condemn and acquire parking areas and to operate them at net cost. However, neither of those will solve the whole problem. We need a larger and more expansive area for the people who are working in the Federal Triangle, and that is the reason for the suggestion I make.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the Commissioner of the Public Buildings Administration, Mr. Reynolds, who appeared before us with reference to estimates concerning this additional housing, stated that those estimates included parking.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I wonder if it would not be well for the Office of Civilian Defense, that is putting on dancing—

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman must be more specific and pick out the particular function of the Office of Civilian Defense to which he refers.

Mr. MAY. We have the Washington Traction Co., that I do not like any too well, because I sometimes get put off when I do not want to and I am not let on when I want to get on, but it reaches out all over the suburban areas of the city here. The business people who work in these offices, banks, department stores, and so forth, not connected with the Government, have very large parking spaces. If they would spend 10 cents to come down in the morning and 10 cents to go back in the evening, instead of driving down and parking their cars in these private lots at 40 or 50 cents a day, that would help a lot.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The difficulty is that we all react alike. We hate to walk four or five blocks if we can snatch a parking space and only walk about one block. There is the element of normal selfishness that enters into the situation which makes it very difficult. The problem calls for mass treatment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Downs].

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Chairman, this bill is the result of a very careful study of the housing situation in Washington and should be approved without a great deal of debate. The Members on both sides of the House have worked diligently to provide the number of houses needed to take care of the people who are coming into Washington daily.

May I pay tribute to our chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES]. I have the honor of serving as chairman of the Subcommittee on Decentralization. This subcommittee conducted hearings lasting over a period of 3 months and much of the data that we secured at these hearings were used in bringing about the presentation of this bill. We found in one instance here in Washington where 46 people were crowded into a 10-room house. You and I know that conditions such as these are not healthy.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWNS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. I was under the impression that that was one of the grounds upon which the decentralization of executive offices was based; that is, it would take ten to forty thousand people from Washington to other sections of the country in order to accommodate those being brought in. I do not understand that there is a necessity for sending forty or fifty thousand people out of the city, and then bringing a corresponding number back into the city. I am wondering whether or not these two arguments con-

flict somewhat and whether or not there is a necessity for sending them out and a necessity for increasing the facilities by bringing an equal number in.

Mr. DOWNS. I believe the gentleman's observation is correct in some instances. I am heartily in favor of decentralization and the President has already started to decentralize certain agencies. During the course of our hearings it was brought out that many agencies which are now in Washington might be moved elsewhere, but we have not been able to decentralize the offices fast enough to keep up with the influx of people coming to Washington.

Mr. HARE. My thought is not so favorable toward decentralization for the reason I feel that they could be more efficient here than if distributed throughout the country; but since there is decentralization and there is quite a large number of employees being taken out of the city, then I question the wisdom of going to the enormous expense of increasing facilities when we have sufficient facilities at present to accommodate as many as we had previously.

Mr. DOWNS. The estimate was given before the committee that 85,000 people would come into Washington within the next few months. We cannot possibly decentralize that many people because some of these agencies cannot be moved at the present time. For instance, there are the War Department and the Navy Department where the increases in personnel are tremendous. The agencies that we can move and the number of people that we will be able to move will be much less than 85,000.

Mr. HARE. If the departments are going to remain here and there is to be no decentralization, then I see no objection to this bill, otherwise, I have my serious doubts.

Mr. DOWNS. I cannot agree with the gentleman that this bill is not justified, because with 85,000 people coming to Washington in the next few months we are going to have a condition here which will make it necessary for more housing.

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWNS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. May I ask the gentleman if he realizes that we have thousands of people in the city of Washington here today not working but living off of relief?

In the meantime, thousands are working on W. P. A., while at the same time in the rural sections of the country, in not only the South but the West, farmers who are being urged to increase production are unable to get any labor on the farms yet we must spend \$50,000,000 to build additional facilities here with all these people crowded in here on relief at the expense of the taxpayers and at the expense of the farmers of the country. Everybody is coming to Washington, we keep on building and we keep on bringing them in.

Mr. DOWNS. I am not aware of the number of persons on the relief rolls in Washington or on W. P. A. rolls, but I shall try to check it up.

May I say in closing that I hope the House will pass this bill, as these funds are needed, and needed very badly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to pay my tribute to the chairman of this committee and his very able committee for the excellent work they have done in bringing this bill before the House.

Those of us who know anything at all about the conditions here in the District have been frightened at what might happen if something were not done about this terrific overcrowding. I agree with all the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has said here today. I want to add to it that as one who has been interested in the District for many years, and who has served as a former chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I think it is certainly time the hospital facilities in the District were enlarged. It has been only by the grace of God that we have not had any epidemic here. If we had, I do not know what the result might have been. The hospitals are inadequate. They have been inadequate for a long time, but they are tremendously inadequate now, when so many hundreds of thousands of people are coming into the District.

I direct particular reference to the obstetrical beds in the District. I do not believe there is anything quite so pitiful as a woman who, when she comes to the time of having her child born, cannot find any place in which to get attention. I am very much interested in the Columbia Hospital here. It is the only strictly maternity hospital in the District. This hospital has been obliged to turn hundreds of women away. It has a magnificent record. Just during the past year 2,636 babies were born in that hospital under the most difficult circumstances, because they are so very overcrowded. That is the case in just this one hospital. The facilities of the Georgetown Hospital and many other hospitals I could name are strained almost to the breaking point. Certainly, I think the work of the committee in bringing in this bill should be greatly commended by every man and woman in this House.

I am also very much interested in the housing situation. I suppose it is because I am a woman and hear more about these things, perhaps, than some of you men do. I have had a great many of the girls who have come from rural districts come to my office to tell me they have found it impossible to get any place to live. It is a rather sad thing to have to say and it is also a very dangerous thing, particularly if you have been reading the newspapers recently and finding out some of the conditions that prevail here due apparently to the lack of a sufficient number of men on the police force in Washington. I do not know what the reason for this condition is, but at any rate the protection here in Washington is not all it should be. I do not know whose fault it is and I am not attempting to lay the blame on anybody in

particular, but I do think there should be something done about it and more men added to the police force.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. May I say that I, in company with other men in this body, recognize the interest the gentleman from New Jersey has in the problems here. I think it might be well to say at this point that when she speaks of the necessity for additional police in the District of Columbia she speaks of a very real need.

Mrs. NORTON. I think it is.

Mr. RANDOLPH. We have here a force of men, of course. It was felt that it was sufficient to take care of the needs of a peacetime city, but now we have a wartime city. These men are being called from strictly police duties to other duties. Some 80 of them were called to the White House under just one order, taken from their duties in official Washington. Some 150 have been called to guard bridges, viaducts, and certain buildings within the District of Columbia. We find there approximately 250 or 300 men taken away from regular police duties in the District of Columbia.

Mrs. NORTON. I realize the truth of everything the gentleman has said. I am not in any sense critical of the work that is being performed by the police department, but I do think the number of men should be increased to protect the city adequately at a time when so many hundreds of thousands of people are in this city.

I am tremendously interested in two phases of this bill, that which has to do with the hospitals and that which has to do with housing, because I think we shall find a greater necessity for housing in the months to come than we have heretofore, and it is pretty bad at the present time. We do want to protect these people who are coming here, particularly the young girls who are coming here, most of them getting only \$1,400 or \$1,600, some even as low as \$1,200 a year. They find it simply impossible to find a place to live or to buy enough food under existing conditions.

I thank the committee again for the excellent work it has done in bringing this bill before the House. I ask you to cooperate with the committee, and sincerely hope this bill passes unanimously.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], who, I understand, wants to ask a question.

Mr. MAY. Yes; I want to propound this question to the chairman of the committee: When I came in awhile ago there was some discussion of the extent to which these houses would be built out in the rural areas, or in the country. Of course, it is designated as a District housing bill.

Mr. LANHAM. No; it says in or nearby the District of Columbia. It is for this metropolitan area.

Mr. MAY. Down at Alexandria, for instance, there is a large naval installation that has brought thousands to that

town. There is another plant going in there, and they are very much crowded. The Government is now moving some kind of multigraphing group over there of some four or five hundred.

Mr. LANHAM. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. MAY. Would this extend to that area?

Mr. LANHAM. That could come under the general housing, of course, but this is primarily for the workers being brought to the District of Columbia and the area immediately adjacent to the District of Columbia, or, in other words, it is for this metropolitan area. Of course, it would have to be in sufficient proximity for the workers to get to their places of employment.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER].

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to compliment and commend the chairman and the members of the committee for the splendid work they have done in connection with defense housing. The committee has worked long hours and made a thorough study of housing conditions, not only in the District of Columbia but in the various defense areas throughout the United States. The district I represent has been designated as an important defense area, and had it not been for the legislation sponsored by this committee I am sure the defense program in my locality would have been very seriously curtailed, due to lack of housing for the workers.

Mr. Chairman, for the most part, Congress has given rapid acceptance to all proposals covering war needs. The program is so important that none of us has sought to delay it unnecessarily. However, there are certain proposals to be submitted to us before the beginning of the new fiscal year which do not require speed and should be closely scrutinized. One of these would authorize a two and one-half billion dollar increase in the R. F. C. borrowing authority. This proposal has no vital bearing upon our military success, and before we rush it through the legislative mill I suggest that we pause to consider just what the R. F. C. and its vast auxiliary empire has accomplished.

I would ask that we give careful thought, for instance, to the R. F. C. Defense Homes Corporation. Let me remind you that this organization was incorporated on October 25, 1940, with an authorized capital of \$10,000,000 to provide homes in areas of extensive defense building and manufacturing where such homes are necessary. This is a worthy purpose, but since we have other agencies created for the same purpose and engaged in the same work, it occurs to me that the Corporation is an unnecessary duplication. Let us take a look at this new agency. It is now little more than a year old. What has it accomplished?

If we look closely, we find that the Defense Homes Corporation has been buying up expensive tracts of land in fashionable areas of Washington for the purpose, I presume, of erecting low-cost

housing units thereon for Government workers. We find that the property generally known as Friendship, owned by Mrs. Evalyn Walsh McLean, has been purchased by this agency. We find, further, that this tract of land consists of 75 acres and that it was purchased from Mrs. McLean by the United States Government for \$1,000,000.

Think of it—well over \$13,000 for each acre of land. And this does not take into account the expenditures to be made for the actual housing itself, the utilities, and incidental appurtenances. This is extravagance which is nothing short of a public scandal.

Another tract purchased by this Corporation is the McCormick-Goodhart property in Prince Georges and Montgomery Counties, Md., just outside of Washington, owned by Leander McCormick-Goodhart, another member of Washington society. Mr. McCormick-Goodhart is on the staff of the British Embassy. His property is many miles away from the Government departments and is not easily accessible. But the Defense Homes Corporation chose this fashionable estate as the site for another low-cost housing development for Government workers.

A Government dormitory for girls who are employed by Uncle Sam is under construction by the Defense Homes Corporation at Sixteenth and Euclid Streets in the fashionable upper Sixteenth Street section of Washington. This is expensive property in an expensive location. It would be of interest to know what fabulous sum was paid for this site and which darling of Capital society owned it.

The fact that some officials of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation nearly always attend the cocktail parties and gold-plate breakfasts of Mrs. Evalyn Walsh McLean may have no bearing on the fact that they were willing to pay her \$1,000,000 in cold cash for a comparatively small tract of land. On the other hand, it looks suspiciously like a drawing-room deal; and if there is an explanation, I think it should be forthcoming quickly.

Mrs. McLean, by the way, is the same dowager whose property at 2000 Massachusetts Avenue is being leased by the Government at \$15,000 per annum. She is the same Mrs. McLean whose town house property was purchased by a private construction group financed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to be used as a site for the building which now houses the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

All of which leads us to believe that Mrs. McLean and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are on good terms, if not actually cronies. If I am wrong in my conclusions, I am perfectly willing to be corrected, but I want an explanation of some kind before I am willing to vote to extend the borrowing capacity of an organization which Congress created to assist businessmen and winds up instead giving aid and financial comfort to Washington's fashionable set.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, may I say to my friend from New York, and for the information of the Committee,

that the funds to which he has been referring do not come out of this measure.

Mr. BEITER. I appreciate that fact. I call this to the attention of the Committee because we are today discussing defense housing, and the facts I have outlined are pertinent. The funds we are to appropriate today will be utilized, I presume, for defense housing projects to be constructed by the United States Housing Authority and the Public Buildings Administration. Both of these agencies have done a good job, and I commend them on their efforts to keep down the costs on the projects under their jurisdiction. I see no need for the Defense Homes Corporation since it merely duplicates, and not too well, the work of these older agencies.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the Democratic keynote of the congressional campaign, set by Boss Flynn recently when he asserted election of a Republican Congress would be "a major disaster" comparable to a great military defeat, was sounded again yesterday by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKEOUGH]. The gentleman is the newly endorsed candidate for the United States Senate of the Democratic organization in Illinois and he made his first political address in this House yesterday. He assailed the Chicago Tribune and its publisher, Colonel McCormick, as "traitors" because the paper had carried an editorial mourning the loss in action in the Philippines of a former Tribune employee. The "treasonable" sentiment expressed in the editorial was this—that many of those most prominent in the clamor for war last year are now safely situated in secure and comfortable positions here in Washington while men like the private killed with MacArthur, who had no part in bringing on the war, were laying down their lives for the flag. The gentleman from Illinois believes it is treason to suggest that certain men go to the front. Certainly all the cherished rights of freedom of speech and freedom of the press have been abolished if his theory is to be accepted.

Like the great majority of American people, I do not know of a more true American than Colonel McCormick. He has done much to preserve our American system of government and to protect our American ideals and institutions. Regardless of criticism, he will continue that fight.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss a matter that I have observed during the past few months that I think ought to have the attention of this House. It is with reference to some of the school facilities of the District. At the present time in Anacostia we have a high school of 1,200-pupil capacity. The Congress has voted funds for the construction of a junior high school. The 1,200-pupil school is, at the present time, a senior-junior high school and has over 1,800

pupils in it. The children are attending school in shifts. They are attending classes in the cafeteria, in the gymnasium, and every other place that is available in that particular school building.

The Kramer High School that was authorized by the Congress is under construction. I would say it is less than 20 percent complete, but even at that stage the War Production Board has served notice that they are going to take this school building for office purposes upon its completion. In fact, it has been stated that priorities for its construction will be taken away unless we permit it to be taken over for office purposes. Present indications are that when September comes and the new school year begins there will be at least 2,000 pupils in the Anacostia Junior-Senior High School.

I think this is a situation that ought to be looked into by the District Committee and by some other committees of the House. Allow this War Production Board to build temporary office buildings and build them in Anacostia, if necessary, but by all means let us allow the boys and girls who live in that section to have an opportunity to have decent school privileges.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Committee on the District of Columbia, realizing the problems to which the gentleman from Kansas has just directed attention, attempted at a conference to bring together a representative of the War Production Board, one from the United States Office of Education, the Superintendent of Schools of the District of Columbia, and other agencies and individuals, who discussed this and other problems. We know that we must provide school facilities for children of thousands of workers who are in Washington, D. C., and I trust that the assurance given us by the representative of the War Production Board that they would give careful attention to expediting the construction of these buildings will be carried out.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the statement of the gentleman from West Virginia. I know the gentleman is familiar with this problem, and I am sure that he will do whatever he can to see to it that these schools be left for school purposes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HAINES].

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, I did not rise to discuss this bill. I have implicit faith in the committee that handles it. My purpose in rising at this time is to announce the death of a very fine young gentleman 24 years of age, residing in my congressional district, at Chambersburg, Pa., William Elliott. He enlisted in the British Auxiliary Service, and an announcement is carried in yesterday's evening local newspaper of his death in an accident in England. It stated that the English Government is burying him with full military honors. I am sure that every Member of this House joins me in expressing to the family of this fine young man our regrets

that he had to make this supreme sacrifice at this time, but we know that he did it believing he was doing what was for the best interests of his fellow men.

Mr. Chairman, the following statement appears in the February 10 issue of the Public Opinion newspaper, Chambersburg, Pa., on the tragic death of First Flying Officer William J. (Bill) Elliott:

[From Public Opinion, Chambersburg, Pa.]

On the eve of his discharge from the American Transport Auxiliary Service in England, First Flying Officer William J. (Bill) Elliott, 24, was killed in a flying accident over England on Sunday, and is to be buried with full military honors this week, according to a cablegram received from British military authorities this morning by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. G. L. Elliott, 614 East King Street. Word of his death established Elliott as Chambersburg's first fatality in World War No. 2.

Enlisting in the British Auxiliary Service last winter with Raymond Hoover, of Chambersburg, rural route 2, Elliott sailed on March 1, 1941, and arrived in England on March 18. Following preliminary training, Elliott was commissioned a first flying officer in the noncombatant auxiliary service and was assigned to transport fighting ships and bombers from one British airport to another.

Mrs. Elliott said today that in a letter received from her son late last month he told of his transfer to White Waltham, Berkshire, England, and added that he "would fly his last plane on February 16," the date of his prearranged discharge from the auxiliary service. He and Hoover planned to return home together later this month.

In his last letter to his parents Elliott told them not to fear for his safety, and lightly related that he had recently had his fortune told and the fortune teller assured him that he "would live to a ripe old age."

British military authorities, notifying the parents of young Elliott's death, gave no details other than he was killed in a "flying accident" over England. Further details of the accident were promised.

Born in Chambersburg on April 18, 1917, Elliott was graduated from the Chambersburg High School in 1935. Following graduation, he became an aviation student at the Sunset Airways, north of town, receiving his private, commercial, and instructor's licenses. He was employed for a time at the local airport as an instructor, later going to Rockville, Md. He was serving as instructor at the Congressional Airport at that place at the time of enlistment in the British Auxiliary Forces.

In addition to his parents, Elliott is survived by one brother, John.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, the housing situation in Washington is rapidly becoming acute. Of course, the President is right when he suggested that those occupying big residences here, whose principal avocation is engaging in social activities, should vacate and make room for men and women who are coming into Washington to do their part in this war of production. I offer a constructive suggestion. Our Government should immediately negotiate for the lease throughout this emergency of some passenger boats and these boats should be brought here and docked along the Potomac. Hotel, hospital, and housing accommodations could thereby be provided for many thousands. I refer to passenger boats, such as the Great Lakes

steamer *Seeandbee*, which has 500 state-rooms, though, of course, this particular boat could not be towed here. There are many similar vessels available. In 1941, 12,000 physicians attended a convention in Cleveland, taxing our hotels beyond capacity. The passenger vessel *Seeandbee* was chartered, berthed at the East Ninth Street pier, and its 500 rooms used as homes. Doctors and their families who were housed there were loud in their praise of that arrangement. This and similar passenger vessels, such as the boats used by the Albany-New York Line, Clyde Mallory Line, the *Richelieu* of the St. Lawrence River Line, Mississippi River boats, ships such as the passenger vessels used on the Potomac to carry passengers and automobiles from Washington to Norfolk, and passenger vessels used on the Florida coast and in New Orleans and other cities. A survey should be undertaken and all such passenger vessels that can be taken without subjecting people who use them during certain seasons of the year to unnecessary hardship, should be chartered and docked here at Washington and used 12 months out of the year as homes for Government workers and Army and Navy employees. Most of these ships are in fact floating hotels. The upkeep would not be expensive when these vessels were not making cruises. These vessels have facilities for the convenience of their guests the same as our most modern hotels. They have running water, heating plants, bathrooms, dining rooms, and linen service.

Sometimes we overlook the obvious. Why undertake construction of many apartments and homes at great expense to our taxpayers when we now have dozens, if not hundreds, of large passenger vessels, which are not ocean-going liners and which are not used 12 months in the year for necessary passenger traffic, but which are available for immediate use at this time to give first-class homes to civilian, Army, and Navy officials, and employees who will reside in Washington throughout the period of this war emergency.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to my colleague on the Republican side for extending me this time. I am in full accord with the provisions of this bill and in support of the bill, and I commend the good work of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], chairman of the committee, in bringing the bill before the House.

While I agree with what the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] said, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], I cannot agree with the statements of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I think one of the most disgraceful things that has come to my attention is an illustration which appeared on the front page of the Washington Daily News, a great metropolitan daily, on February 10, 1941, just about a year ago. In a full-page illustration it reads:

No man's land for boys in uniform designated in southwest Washington.

The area in black on the map bounded, roughly, by Fourth Street on the west, F and G Streets SW. on the south, Canal Street on the north, and New Jersey Avenue SE. on the east will be out of bounds. Nobody from Fort Meade or Arlington had better be caught in it.

I wonder who is responsible for that disgraceful condition under the shadows of this Capitol? Between the Capitol Grounds of the most beautiful capitol on earth and the beautiful grounds of the War College, where the elite of our Army are quartered, down between the Anacostia and Potomac Rivers, there is a slum so disgraceful that the boys in uniform are prohibited from going into that area. What is our National Capital Park and Planning Commission doing? What is our Fine Arts Commission doing, coming here and asking us now to clutter up the beautiful parks of this city with automobiles—five-passenger cars, if you please—owned by clerks, occupied in most part by one individual who comes down to work, and which must be stored in these beautiful parks, one of the few things of beauty in this city? I am wondering what kind of planning has led to that condition.

It is my idea from my 9 years in the Capitol of the United States that there is a lot of land and plenty of room in the District of Columbia if it were properly utilized. I wonder who is responsible for the condition that we find in this area between Florida Avenue and Seventh Street, north of the business district. When a man goes to a Government agency to make a loan he is told that due to the infiltration of undesirable races he is not permitted to make a loan in that area. Let us utilize the ground within the District of Columbia, so that when the rubber tires play out, so that when these five-passenger cars can no longer operate, there will be living facilities and building facilities for the people working for these departments in the Capital.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I desire.

I just want to say, in connection with this housing in the District of Columbia, that this legislation is absolutely necessary in the first place. We all know that for months and months there has been a tremendous influx of people coming here to work for the Government. During the conference between the managers on the part of the House and the Senate on the Lanham Act, we spent a great deal of time discussing the housing problem. Thousands of employees have come here and are working here, and thousands more are on their way. Certainly the Government must provide homes for the people they are asking to come here to take part in this national defense effort. Probably 50 percent of those who come here are single, and for that type of person dormitories will be erected to take care of them. We must also provide larger units where families, some with children perhaps, are brought in.

In connection with this vast expansion of our public pay rolls and employment in Washington has come a tremendous strain on the public utilities of

the District. It has long been established that we need additional facilities for our water service. We need larger reservoirs and larger water mains.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I wonder if any cognizance was taken in this entire housing matter of something which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] said last week, in regard to following through the appropriations—whether we have done anything to investigate the need for quite so many people and the use to which they are being put, and whether the problem is as real as it appears to be?

Mr. HOLMES. I will say for the benefit of my colleague from Ohio that as a result of the enactment of the first Lanham Act a subcommittee of the committee which took the responsibility of recommending that legislation to the House was appointed with that object in mind. That subcommittee consisted of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL], and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] on the majority side, and myself and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] on the minority side. Before we would recommend to this House any further legislation or increase of authorization for anything under the Lanham Act this subcommittee made a comprehensive study from coast to coast, visited many of the housing projects. We found some conditions that were just horrible. These conditions we called to the attention of the responsible officials and I feel sure they were corrected and that such things will not happen again. We are very conversant with the housing needs of the country as a whole and have given a great deal of study to the problem here in the District of Columbia.

When the gentlewoman asks me whether this committee can determine the need here, I answer her by saying that all we can do is to depend on the estimates given us by responsible representatives of the Government who have investigated and found out the approximate influx there will be from future employment in the war effort in the District of Columbia. I can assure the gentlewoman from Ohio that this committee is just as much interested as anyone can be to see that every dollar of this money authorized by the Congress is spent legitimately and honestly and that the Government gets full value for every dollar spent.

Mrs. BOLTON. I have no question as to the expenditures by the housing group. I question the necessity for bringing so many people to Washington, especially when we find so many of the employees idle all the morning, a great many mornings of the week.

Mr. HOLMES. That is the same troublesome problem we all have.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. HOLMES. Certainly.

Mrs. BOLTON. Who determines the location of these buildings?

Mr. HOLMES. The Federal Works Administration; Colonel Palmer deter-

mines the need. That is conveyed to the Federal Works Administration, and they authorize the building in compliance with the survey.

Mrs. BOLTON. And are they taking into consideration the need for plenty of open spaces around these projects?

Mr. HOLMES. We have been impressed in our investigation throughout the country with the suitable provision that has been made, generous provision for suitable playgrounds for the children of the families to enjoy some recreation.

As I was saying, this tremendous influx of people has already taxed the capacity of the public utilities of the District. In this legislation we provide approximately \$10,000,000 for the most important work of enlarging reservoirs, the building of additional purification plants, additions to hospitals, schools, and streets, for we find these enlargements to be very essential in order to take care of this increase.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield.

Mr. HAINES. If I understand, the bill contains a provision giving private parties the right to purchase these houses?

Mr. HOLMES. Yes.

Mr. HAINES. And that they may be financed under provisions of the F. H. A. Act?

Mr. HOLMES. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," is hereby amended by inserting after section 312 thereof the following title:

"TITLE IV

"Sec. 401. In order to relieve an acute shortage of housing, public works, and equipment thereof presently existing and impending in and near the District of Columbia and impeding war activities, the Federal Works Administrator is authorized to provide, in and near the District of Columbia, such housing, public works, and equipment thereof, including, but without limitation, permanent and temporary housing, living quarters for single persons, schools, waterworks, sewers, sewage, garbage- and refuse-disposal facilities, public-sanitation facilities, works for the treatment and purification of water, hospitals and other places for the care of the sick, recreational facilities, streets, roads, and any other types of necessary public works or equipment therefor; and in providing such housing, public works, and equipment therefor the Administrator is authorized to exercise the same powers with respect to land acquisition, construction, procuring of materials and like matters, the making of loans and grants and contributions as are granted to him under subsections (a) and (b) of section 1 of this act and subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 202 of this act.

"Sec. 402. The housing provided under this title may be sold and disposed of as expeditiously as possible: *Provided*, That in disposition of said housing consideration shall be given to its full market value and said housing or any part thereof shall not, unless

specifically authorized by Congress, be conveyed to any public or private agency organized for slum clearance or to provide subsidized housing for persons of low income.

"Sec. 403. (a) The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to accept for the District of Columbia, and the Administrator is authorized to make to the District of Columbia, advancements for the provision of public works and equipment therefor, such advancements to be deposited with the Secretary of the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia.

"(b) Sums advanced to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia hereunder shall be available for the provision, without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, of any or all public works and equipment therefor described in section 401 hereof, and for administrative expenses in connection therewith, including employment of engineering and other professional services and other technical and administrative personnel without reference to the civil-service requirements or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The repayment of any sums so advanced and the payment of interest thereon shall be in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as are set forth in sections 3 and 4 of the act of December 20, 1941 (Public Law No. 362, 77th Cong.).

"(c) The Commissioners shall submit with their annual estimates to the Congress a report of their activities and expenditures under this section.

"Sec. 404. The sum of \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended, is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this title and for administrative expenses in connection therewith in accordance with the provisions of this act."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 7, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 301 of the act entitled 'An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes', approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out 'sections 1 and 202' and inserting in lieu thereof 'sections 1, 202, and 401.'

"Sec. 2. Section 304 of such act of October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'As used in this section the term "local municipalities" shall include the District of Columbia.'

"Sec. 3. (a) Section 306 of such act of October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'As used in this section the term "State" shall include the District of Columbia.'

"(b) Section 307 of such act of October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'As used in this section the term "State" shall include the District of Columbia.'

"Sec. 4. Such act of October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by adding after section 312 thereof the following new title:"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6483) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended,

pursuant to House Resolution 437, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 303, nays 18, not voting 105, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

YEAS—303

Allen, Ill.	Crawford	Hendricks
Allen, La.	Creal	Hess
Andersen,	Crowther	Hill, Wash.
H. Carl	Culkin	Hinshaw
Anderson, Calif.	Cullen	Hobbs
Anderson,	Cunningham	Holbrook
N. Mex.	Curtis	Holmes
Andresen,	D'Alesandro	Hook
August H.	Davis, Ohio	Hope
Andrews	Day	Houston
Angell	Delaney	Howell
Arnold	Dickstein	Hull
Barden	Dies	Imhoff
Barnes	Dingell	Izac
Bates, Ky.	Dirksen	Jackson
Beam	Domeneaux	Jacobsen
Beiter	Doughton	Jenkins, Ohio
Bell	Downs	Jenks, N. H.
Bennett	Dewey	Jensen
Bishop	Dworschak	Johns
Blackney	Eaton	Johnson, Calif.
Bloom	Eberharter	Johnson, Ind.
Boehne	Elliott, Mass.	Johnson,
Boggs	Elliott, Calif.	Luther A.
Boland	Elston	Johnson, Okla.
Bolton	Engel	Kean
Bonner	Englebright	Kefauver
Boykin	Fenton	Kelly, Ill.
Bradley, Mich.	Fish	Kennedy,
Bradley, Pa.	Fitzgerald	Martin J.
Brooks	Fitzpatrick	Kennedy,
Brown, Ga.	Flaherty	Michael J.
Brown, Ohio	Flannagan	Keogh
Bryson	Fogarty	Kilburn
Buck	Folger	Kilday
Buckley, N. Y.	Forand	Kirwan
Bulwinkle	Ford, Leland M.	Klein
Burdick	Ford, Thomas F.	Kocikowski
Burgin	Gale	Koppelman
Butler	Gamble	Kunkel
Byron	Gathings	Landis
Canfield	Gavagan	Lanham
Cannon, Mo.	Gearhart	Larrabee
Capozzoli	Gehrmann	Lea
Carlson	Gibson	Leavy
Carter	Gilchrist	LeCompte
Case, S. Dak.	Gillette	Lesinski
Casey, Mass.	Gillie	Lewis
Celler	Gore	Ludlow
Chapman	Gossett	Lynch
Chenoweth	Graham	McCormack
Chiferfield	Grant, Ala.	McGehee
Clark	Grant, Ind.	McIntyre
Clason	Gregory	McLaughlin
Claypool	Gwynne	McLean
Clevenger	Haines	Maas
Cluett	Hall	Maclejewski
Cochran	Edwin Arthur	Mahon
Coffee, Nebr.	Hall	Manasco
Coffee, Wash.	Leonard W.	Mansfield
Cole, N. Y.	Hancock	Marcantonio
Collins	Harris, Ark.	Martin, Iowa
Cooley	Harris, Va.	Martin, Mass.
Cooper	Harter	May
Copeland	Healey	Merritt
Costello	Hébert	Meyer, Md.
Courtney	Heffernan	Michener
Cox	Heldinger	Mills, Ark.

Mills, La.	Richards	Sutphin
Mitchell	Robertson,	Sweeney
Monroney	N. Dak.	Taber
Mott	Robertson, Va.	Talbot
Murray	Robison, Ky.	Talle
Nelson	Rockwell	Tarver
Nichols	Rodgers, Pa.	Terry
Norrell	Rogers, Mass.	Thill
Norton	Rolph	Thom
O'Brien, Mich.	Russell	Thomas, Tex.
O'Connor	Sabath	Thomason
O'Hara	Sanders	Tibbott
Oliver	Sasser	Tinkham
O'Neal	Scanlon	Traynor
O'Toole	Schuetz	Treadway
Patman	Schulte	Van Zandt
Patrick	Scrugham	Vincent, Ky.
Patton	Secret	Vinson, Ga.
Pearson	Shannon	Vorys, Ohio
Peterson, Ga.	Sheppard	Ward
Pfeifer,	Short	Weaver
Joseph L.	Sikes	Weiss
Pfeiffer,	Smith, Maine	Welch
William T.	Smith, Ohio	Wene
Ploeser	Smith, Va.	Wheat
Plumley	Smith, Wash.	Whelchel
Poage	Smith, Wis.	White
Powers	Snyder	Whitten
Priest	Somers, N. Y.	Whittington
Rabaut	South	Wigglesworth
Ramsay	Sparkman	Williams
Ramspeck	Spence	Woodruff, Mich.
Randolph	Springer	Woodrum, Va.
Rankin, Miss.	Starnes, Ala.	Wright
Rankin, Mont.	Stearns, N. H.	Young
Reece, Tenn.	Stefan	Youngdahl
Reed, Ill.	Stevenson	Zimmerman
Reed, N. Y.	Sullivan	
Rees, Kans.	Sumners, Tex.	

NAYS—18

Beckworth	Guyer	Moser
Boren	Hare	Pace
Camp	Jones	Rich
Cartwright	Knutson	Sumner, Ill.
Duncan	Lambertson	West
Fulmer	McMillan	Wickersham

NOT VOTING—105

Arends	Hill, Colo.	Plauché
Baldwin	Hoffman	Rivers
Barry	Hunter	Rizley
Bates, Mass.	Jarman	Robinson, Utah
Baumbart	Jarrett	Rockefeller
Bender	Jennings	Rogers, Okla.
Bland	Johnson, Ill.	Romjue
Buckler, Minn.	Johnson,	Sacks
Burch	Lyndon B.	Satterfield
Byrne	Johnson, W. Va.	Sauthoff
Cannon, Fla.	Jonkman	Schaefer, Ill.
Cole, Md.	Kee	Scott
Colmer	Keefe	Shafer, Mich.
Cravens	Kelley, Pa.	Shanley
Crosser	Kerr	Sheridan
Davis, Tenn.	Kinzer	Simpson
Dewey	Kleberg	Smith, Pa.
Disney	Kramer	Smith, W. Va.
Ditter	Lane	Steagall
Dondero	McGranery	Stratton
Douglas	McGregor	Tenerowicz
Durham	McKeough	Thomas, N. J.
Edmiston	Maciora	Tolan
Ellis	Magnuson	Voorhis, Calif.
Faddis	Mason	Vreeland
Fellows	Mundt	Wadsworth
Ford, Miss.	Murdock	Walter
Gerlach	Myers, Pa.	Wasielewski
Gifford	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wilson
Granger	O'Day	Winter
Green	O'Leary	Wolcott
Halleck	Osmers	Wolfenden, Pa.
Harness	Paddock	Wolverton, N. J.
Harrington	Peterson, Fla.	Worley
Hart	Pierce	
Hartley	Pittenger	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Bland with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Ford of Mississippi with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Mundt.
Mr. Crosser with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Hunter with Mr. Kinzer.
Mr. Maciora with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Kramer with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Dewey.
Mr. Johnson of West Virginia with Mr. Rockefeller.

Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. McKeough with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. Ellis with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Jarrett.
Mr. Murdock with Mr. Johnson of Illinois.
Mr. Disney with Mr. Vreeland.
Mr. Green with Mr. Gerlach.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Rizley.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Granger with Mr. Simpson.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Jonkman.
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Pierce with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Harness.
Mr. Cravens with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Kerr with Mr. O'Brien of New York.
Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania with Mr. Baumhart.

Mr. Sacks with Mr. Pittenger.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Baldwin.
Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Ploeser.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Shafer of Michigan.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Hill of Colorado.
Mr. Edmiston with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. Faddis with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Jennings.

Mr. Shanley with Mr. Winters.
Mr. McGranery with Mr. Sauthoff.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
Mr. Voorhis of California with Mr. Magnuson.

Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Tenerowicz.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Rogers of Oklahoma.

Mr. BECKWORTH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article appearing in today's Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter I have written to members of the Cabinet.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a newspaper article that I referred to in my remarks today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HAINES]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we have had our Pearl Harbor. Now we have our Singapore. Hitler does not wait. The Japanese are not waiting. It is imperative to pass every war measure immediately. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD on this subject.

I hope and pray the Rules Committee will soon report a rule for consideration

of my bill, H. R. 6293, to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps to serve with the United States Army. The women of this country are eager and anxious to serve. If I needed to be assured of this I would be convinced by the tremendous flood of letters I have received from every part of the country, from women seeking to enroll and serve as auxiliaries to our Army. Several times I have been asked concerning the cost of this legislation, and I would like to make it clear that it would cost nothing in reality, for every one of these women would replace a man who is now doing the work for which they would be assigned. Secretary of War Stimson and General Marshall both have stated there is a tremendous and immediate need for this legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] may extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES]?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF LAW RELATIVE TO WITHDRAWAL OF BRANDY

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5802) to amend certain provisions of law relative to the withdrawal of brandy for fortification of wines and production of wines, brandy, and fruit spirits, so as to remove therefrom certain unnecessary restrictions, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 6, after the words "cantaloup brandy", insert "; and by inserting at the end of the first paragraph the following new sentence: 'The maximum penal sum of any bond required by this subchapter for any bonded winery or bonded storeroom shall be \$50,000.'"

Page 4, after line 20, insert:

"(h) Clause (2) of section 5 (f) of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act (49 Stat. 984) is amended to read as follows: '(2) as will provide the consumer with adequate information as to the identity and quality of the products advertised, the alcoholic content thereof (except the statements of, or statements likely to be considered as statements of, alcoholic content of malt beverages and wines are prohibited), and the person responsible for the advertisement;'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK]?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, that bill was up this morning—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California informed the Chair that the gentleman who objected this morning had withdrawn his objection, otherwise the Chair would not have recognized the gentleman from California.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I tried to get these amendments this morning to see what the bill contained. The amendments are not published, and we could not get them. I examined the copy at the Clerk's desk. I am not sure about this bill. If the last Senate amendment does what I think it does, and prohibits placing in these advertisements a statement of the alcoholic content of the wines, then I believe I shall object to this request. I think we ought to have time to study this matter. I do not believe it should come up today, because we want to examine these amendments before we act upon them.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I did not understand that the gentleman from Pennsylvania was seriously objecting this morning.

Mr. RICH. I did not object this morning, but we wanted to get this information. I asked the gentleman and did not get the information, so I am eager to get it now before we let the bill pass.

Mr. BUCK. The amendment adopted by the Senate only applies the same rule to sweet wines that is now in effect in regard to dry wines. I do not see how the gentleman can object. I have discussed this matter again with every member of the minority on the Committee on Ways and Means. This was unanimously reported by the committee. I was also instructed to get a rule from the Committee on Rules to consider this bill, if necessary. Does the gentleman want me to go before the Rules Committee now?

Mr. RICH. No; but a week or so ago we passed by unanimous consent legislation that granted pensions to Members of Congress. If I had been on the floor it would not have gone through. I am not going to let any legislation go through here now about which there is any doubt as to its being wise legislation. That is the only reason I am holding this up. I ask that the gentleman withdraw his request for the day and wait until another day until we have an opportunity to make further study of these amendments.

Mr. BUCK. Would the gentleman object to a request that the bill go to conference?

Mr. RICH. I will not object to that.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House disagree to the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 5802 and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DOUGHTON, BUCK, and CROWTHER.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the busi-

ness in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be in order on Thursday of that week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I shall not object, but I do this simply to find out the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. On tomorrow, which is the anniversary of Lincoln's birth, no legislation will be considered.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The House will be in session tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. The House will be in session tomorrow. As far as next week is concerned, the Consent Calendar will be called on Monday, and then the State, Commerce, Justice, and the Judiciary appropriation will be brought up for consideration. Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday will be devoted to the Committee on Appropriations. If the consideration of the State, Commerce, Justice, and the Judiciary appropriation bill is not completed on Monday, which it probably will not be, it will go over until Wednesday, and on Tuesday the fifth supplemental defense appropriation bill will be considered. The Calendar Wednesday business will be in order on Thursday, and the Committee on Labor will have the call.

The resolution extending the life of the Dies committee has been reported out, but it cannot be considered on any of those days. Three hours of debate are allowed, I understand.

A week from next Monday is Washington's Birthday. I am hopeful that we shall be able to arrange legislative matters so that Members who have pressing engagements on Washington's Birthday and over that week end will be able to meet them, and that no business will be considered on Friday.

That is the program for next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COCHRAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman mean that the Dies resolution will not be reached next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot see how it can be, in view of the important legislative program for next week. I am sure the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] would not insist upon that resolution being taken up on Friday of next week, when it can probably be considered early the following week.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I further reserve the right to object to get some information for myself. The deficiency bill that the gentleman spoke of, as I understand, will not come before the House for consideration until Tuesday of next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to state definitely, but it will either be Tuesday or Wednesday.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And not before Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Not before Tuesday.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Is that the deficiency bill that carries the request of the President for some considerable number of billions of dollars?

Mr. McCORMACK. Twenty-odd billions of dollars; yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a telegram from Governor O'Connor, of Maryland, and my written reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

ETIENNE BURIN DES ROZIERES

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to a situation which strikes me as being very dangerous to our war efforts.

One Etienne Burin des Roziers, third secretary to the French Embassy in Washington, has left for Tokyo. This in itself and of itself may not seem significant. However, when we consider this in the light of the announcement made in Parliament yesterday, to the effect that General Rommel, the Nazi general in Libya, has been supplied through French North Africa by Vichy France with materials that we are giving and have been giving to Vichy France, and when we consider that Vichy France is in reality a puppet government of Adolf Hitler the conclusion becomes inescapable that a sudden transfer of a third secretary, who has spent considerable time in the French Embassy here in Washington, to Tokyo means that this third secretary is transferred to Tokyo so that he can give information to the Japanese with regard to our national interests.

Mr. COCHRAN. How is he going to get there?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. He is going to get there the same way other Vichy diplomats are getting there. He has been transferred to Tokyo and is on his way there with diplomatic immunity. We do not know what he is carrying either in his baggage or in his mind. He is a representative of Vichy France—the same Vichy France that has been receiving supplies from us and giving them to General Rommel through French North Africa. All of a sudden Vichy France takes its third secretary to the French Embassy here and sends him to Tokyo, after he has been here a considerable time. This, in my opinion, is utilizing the French Embassy for espionage purposes, and it seems to me it is about time we get tough.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PENSIONS FOR CONGRESSMEN

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, is there any doubt in your mind as to whom the people should and will hold responsible for the legislation that extends pensions not only to Members of Congress, Harold Ickes, Madam Perkins, and the rest of the members of the President's Cabinet, the Vice President and President, and thousands of political appointees that are blanketed under the provisions of the act? I wish to repeat a speech given on July 14, 1939, by one of our Democratic colleagues right here on this floor. Here are words of one of our homespun colleagues, and most assuredly a man of the people. The speech is as follows:

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, should this bill pass in this form, I presume it would be the first time in the history of America that any legislative body, be it a city council, a State legislature, or Congress, which had the power to appropriate money, voted themselves a pension. Of course, I know there is a certain amount of demagoguery about this, but in spite of what you say, we are all here as a matter of choice, because we prefer to be here to doing something else. There is no dispute about that, and at this time of financial crisis, with so many people demanding aid, it is the wrong time of the year, the wrong time of the moon, for Congressmen to vote themselves a pension, and then go back to have hurled in their teeth some particular thing that did not get through that somebody else wanted. People would say that we had voted a pension for ourselves and had failed to do so for somebody else. Talk about retirement. God knows that as far as retirement is concerned you will get it pretty quick—those of you who vote for this bill. You will get it and you will get it without pay besides. This is a nice issue with which to go before the people in 1940, is it not? What about the Democratic Party? Remember if this bill passes, it will have to pass through a majority of Democrats voting for it. Then I say especially again that it is the wrong time of the moon to take this question up.

Further, there are certain sections of the country where the political party on one side or the other is predominant and where Members come back to Congress year after year, but more than half of the districts waver back and forth as between the two parties, and it is not fair to those men who live in doubtful districts, as compared with those who live in districts where the politics is one way and where Members have opportunity for coming back year after year. I shall be quite well satisfied if I can come here the required length of time to which I might be eligible to get an annuity, without the annuity, and please do not forget that there are lots of people just as able as you are, just as smart as you are, regardless of who you are, who are ready and willing to take your places at any time you indicate that you are through—and sometimes when you do not. This is laden with political dynamite, and lots of you who cast your vote for this bill will get retirement without annuity.

Just answer these questions:

First. Do you realize that we are in the midst of a war? Do you realize that thousands of our young men are in the armed forces of our country at a small salary? Do you realize that thousands of Red Cross workers are giving freely of their time and energy? Do you realize that examining doctors and draft boards are working hour after hour without pay? Do you realize that many business-

men are being put out of business and that thousands of men are losing their jobs? Do you realize that bonds and stamps must be sold and that this legislation is going to impair this program?

Second. Do you realize that the average per capita income of our people is \$500 to \$600; that the income of labor of our country is around \$1,300; and the average farm income is about the same? Should Members of Congress come before these groups? Do you realize this legislation as well as Office of Civilian Defense weaknesses retard our war program? Is it any surprise newspapers criticize this legislation? Do you wonder that taxpayers are shocked about this act?

Third. There is no use spending time on how this legislation happened to get passed. It is now time to make good and not make excuses. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] in his speech last Thursday said:

This bill was approved by the Civil Service Commission, but the language bringing in the Members of the Congress and the Senators was put in by me on my own responsibility and at the request of numerous Members of this body who wanted that privilege and that right.

Today's papers quote the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] as saying that the public is unduly excited. Whether the public is unduly excited or not, it is excited enough so we better get the Rees, Smith, or Wickersham bill reported out of the committee and repeal the portion of the act that includes elective officers. And the quicker the better.

Fourth. Does anyone here think that the argument made by our colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL] in 1939 are of more importance today? With the country at peace in 1939—at war in 1942—with the public debt soon three times what it was then—do you not think this is most assuredly the wrong time of the moon if there ever was a wrong time of the moon?

Fifth. There is always a demand for unity. If you want unity in the country, you better bring this Reece repeal measure right out on the floor for consideration. If you really want "unity" right here on the floor of the House, you should bring this measure out of committee immediately. Whether the President will get \$17,000 or \$37,000 per year, as now stated in the press, is, of course, important, but the thing of greatest importance is to let the people of this country know that the "will of the people is the law of the land." The will of the people is to repeal this elected-officers provision, and the sooner we do it the better it will be for our country.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. If the gentleman was so opposed to the bill, why did he not object to it when it came up on the Consent Calendar?

Mr. MURRAY. I yielded to the gentleman from Georgia, and I will answer him by saying that the reason I did not object was for the same reason that I

wrote and told my people, and that is that I was not present at that time, and it seems that some 400 other Members were not, either.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MURRAY. I have answered the gentleman's question, and I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. When that bill came up on this floor, it was on the Consent Calendar, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] did not mention that that complicated bill contained pensions for Congressmen. Furthermore, he spoke for some time, which took about an inch or two in the RECORD, without ever mentioning that it contained pensions for Congressmen and other elected officers. I personally feel that that is inconsistent with our ideas of justice in this country; that we should have notice of controversial bills on this floor.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I have not yet answered the gentleman from Illinois. The gentleman from Georgia should not become impatient. The gentleman will find that in that RECORD of December 1 the question asked by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] called attention to the fact that it was a pretty large bill to bring up under unanimous consent, some 10 pages, as I remember it, and he asked for an explanation of the bill at that time.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. But in the explanation the gentleman from Georgia, who sponsored the bill, never once mentioned any pensions for elected officers.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Has the gentleman found anybody who objected to the bill?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I have. One person on the Civil Service Committee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], says that he was opposed to the bill, and that it was put over when he was not on the floor. Whether that is true or not I do not know, but I rely upon his integrity.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. RICH. I think when legislation is brought before this House like legislation granting pensions to Members of Congress, when Townsendsites all over the country want pensions and we will not consider them, that Members of the House ought to be notified that such legislation is being brought up. I was on the floor 15 minutes before opening that day, and I went down to lunch, and I was at lunch when it happened. The gentleman was not on the floor, or he would not have allowed such legislation to go through.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is it not true that when the conference report upon that bill came in, it was known what it contained? I think there were two Members—the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]—who were the only two Members in this House at that time who voiced their opposition to the conference report; and, as the gentleman knows, there was an opportunity to beat the bill by all these people who are now complaining by voting down the conference report.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman from Missouri is eminently correct, except it was not a conference report. The House agreed to the Senate amendments by unanimous consent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. In just a moment, until I make my statement. I asked the gentleman from Wisconsin who preceded me a fair question, and he answered it, and the gentleman from Illinois rose and dragged in the question about what happened on the call of the Consent Calendar.

I say to her, Did you not know that the Senate debated this bill a whole day? Did you not know they had two roll calls on it, and that it came back to the House, and if you were opposed to it and wanted to stop it, why did you not object on January 21? I say that to every other Member who has gotten up on this floor and demagogued about this bill.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Do not call me a demagogue. I sat here waiting for that conference report.

Mr. RAMSPECK. All right. If the cap fits, the lady can wear it. I do not yield further.

The facts are, this bill came up in its regular way on the Consent Calendar on December 1. What the lady says about my explanation of it is true. The bill went to the Senate. It was debated in the Senate on January 19 for a full day. The newspapers were full of it. They wrote about the Byrd amendment undertaking to require that Members of Congress should pay for their entire service before they got any annuity. The RECORD was full of it. There was debate hour after hour over there, and every Member of the House who was on the job attending to his or her duty knew as well as I did that this bill had to come back to this House for conference or acceptance of the amendments adopted in the Senate.

I have no objection to any Member taking care of themselves, but when they undertake to stigmatize me and say to the country that I undertook to sneak this bill through, as some of them have said—some of them said it was a joker, when they knew, if they read the bill at all, that it was in the face of the bill as originally introduced a year ago this month. Now it is time to call names and persons here, and if there is going to be too much of this demagoguing around here I am going to begin to call the roll.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Do you not believe that the membership of the House should have been given some warning or some notice that you intended to bring the conference report here at a certain time?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I did give notice in the usual way. The gentleman is a member of the Appropriations Committee and he knows the practice. The gentleman knows that whenever a Member in charge of a bill intends to ask unanimous consent to concur in Senate amendments, he consults, first, the Speaker to see if he can get recognition; second, his majority leader; third, the minority leader; and fourth, the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. RICH. That is right.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I did that in this case, and not a single one of the persons involved will deny it. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] who is ranking member of my committee, was on the floor at the time and was notified by me that I expected to bring it up, and that I had spoken to the minority leader about it.

Mr. RICH. I appreciate that you asked the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader, and they all agreed that the matter might be taken up, but the rank and file of the Members of the House are not always on the floor. They did not know when you were going to bring it up.

Mr. RAMSPECK. There was no conference report. The bill did not go to conference. The Senate amendments were agreed to in this House by unanimous consent, after a series of questions asked by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSON] and after the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] had expressed their opposition.

Mr. COCHRAN. Did anyone present object to the consideration of the Senate amendments?

Mr. RAMSPECK. They did not.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 5 additional minutes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I just want 1 minute to answer the question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 1 additional minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman, of course, knows that the press of the country has for some unknown reason, inexplicable to me, misrepresented this bill from start to finish.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; that is true.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It has gone out to the country that it is a pension, that it is

a "grab" that the Congressmen are taking out of the Treasury of the United States, when nothing is further from the truth.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the facts were known and if the press wanted to be fair to the country and put this bill before the country as is, I doubt whether there would be any more objection to it than there was at the time the fourth-class postmasters of the country were put under the Social Security Act, the same as the Congressmen were under this act.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not believe they would if they got the facts, but the newspapers have not given them the facts. They have made people believe it is a \$4,000 a year pension out of the United States Treasury, whereas nothing could be further from the truth.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia may proceed for an additional minute. He is the author of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not a further fact that the average service of a Member of Congress is something like 4 years?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not know just what the average is, but I believe the Library of Congress has stated that the average person elected to the House served only one term.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I hand the gentleman a letter from the Legislative Reference Service and ask him what it states.

Mr. RAMSPECK. This letter from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress states:

Generally the average Member has served two and one-half terms. We have made a statistical survey of the length of service of House Members from 1789 through 1938, mainly from Congressional Directories. During that time 8,005 persons served in the House. Of these, 38 percent served 1 term; 27 percent, 2 terms; 13 percent, 3 terms; 7 percent, 4 terms; 4 percent, 5 terms; 3 percent, 6 terms; and 2 percent, 7 terms. The general average would not be affected very much by the compilations of figures for the past 3 years.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And is it not a fact that even if a Member has served 5 years, before he could participate at all he would have to reach the age of 62?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is true, and he would have to pay in contributions which, after July 1, would amount to \$500 per year.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And is it not a fact that, as the bill passed the House, it provided that before a Member could participate at all he would have to pay into the Treasury 5 percent of his salary for the years he had served?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No. The option was left in the bill for Members to make back payment or not as they see fit; but they do have to pay, in my judgment, from January 24, the date the act became effective. If they do not make the back payment the annuity provided by the law is reduced by whatever the payment they failed to make would have purchased on an actuarial basis.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In other words, if no back pay is put in by the annuitant, then the amount he receives would be reduced accordingly?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to stand here and say I was not present when the bill was passed, nor am I going to say I did not know what was in the bill; but I will admit I did not think there was anything in the measure which would warrant anyone in saying a Member of Congress could get an annuity of \$4,000 by paying 5 percent of 1 day's pay, as some charge, and an investigation on my part discloses there is not.

Mr. Speaker, so many misleading statements have been made relative to the provisions of the amendments to the act it might be helpful to give a little information relative to just what Congress has been doing in the past in reference to retirement measures.

I am going to tell you a little something about what you have been doing. Understand, I say "you." You are talking now about less than \$100,000, for, as I understand it, this provision, including elective officials, cannot possibly cost the retirement fund more than \$100,000 a year. Is that correct, I ask the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Eighty thousand dollars a year is my understanding.

Mr. COCHRAN. For the present fiscal year you have voted \$82,929,748 to pay for the retirement of the enlisted men, the commissioned officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Public Health, and Coast and Geodetic Survey, and they do not contribute one cent toward any retirement fund. When they retire they get three-quarters of the pay they were receiving at the time they left the service. You voted for that. So did I.

You also voted \$504,000 to pay to the retired judges, who receive their full pay for the rest of their lives when they retire, and they only have to serve 10 years and be 70 years of age. You voted for that; so did I.

Then there is another fund you probably do not know anything about, the Foreign Service, a most liberal law. They do contribute 5 percent and have for a number of years, but when they retire they get three-quarters of their pay, and there is even a provision in that law which says even if they are discharged for inefficiency they can get half of their pay for the rest of their lives. This includes Ambassadors and Ministers. You voted for that; so did I. We appropriate \$636,000 to support the Foreign Service retirement fund every year.

Practically everyone here voted for the Railroad Retirement Act; the only ones who did not are the Members who are serving their first term. I do not know of any opposition to that law. There was none. The railroad men pay into

their own retirement fund, but the Government of the United States administers the law, and it costs the taxpayers of this country over \$2,000,000 a year at the present time, and is going to mount every year as it grows, as the law provides the Government is to administer the act. Yes; we are appropriating the money to administer it. We are appropriating the taxpayers' money for this purpose. You voted for that; so did I.

I do not know of a Member of this House who has ever taken the floor and said a word in reference to the \$82,000,000-plus that is appropriated for the organizations I have mentioned or who ever made the suggestion that those benefiting should be required to pay into the retirement fund the same as civilian employees, other than myself. I spoke on it two or three times, and it is in the Record.

There never was a word said in reference to the retirement-law amendments until the newspapers of the country started to criticize.

In my opinion the papers are not so much concerned about what was done but in the main complain because it was passed at this time.

Please bear in mind the amendments did not deal solely with Members of Congress, but with 170,000 Government employees who had no right under the law to benefit by social security legislation. They, like the Members of Congress, were out in the cold. And do not forget it increases the contribution of every Government employee to the fund to 5 percent.

Benefiting under the amendments are all officers and employees from the President down, who in the past were not eligible. This includes hundreds of officials receiving as much as Members of Congress as well as some officials receiving more. There is one member of the Cabinet who, if he joined, could receive a liberal annuity by reason of his age and Government service, both in this body and the one at the other end of the Capitol, as well as in the executive branch.

In my opinion the people of this country would not complain if by congressional action this member of the Cabinet was voted his full salary for the rest of his life. His service to his country warrants it.

So if you repeal these amendments you deny not only Members of Congress the right to join, but also 170,000 officials and employees of the Government.

I never believed in retirement for Members of Congress until my attention was called to an article in the Reader's Digest by businessmen in St. Louis some time ago. After I read it I thought it would be a sound policy. The argument advanced by the author of that article and the businessmen of the country at the time was that a Member would be more independent in voting and it would result in great savings to the Government. Let me cite this example. At that time there was an item pending in the House to provide for a reclamation project, and we defeated it. It was in the Interior Department appropriation bill. The bill went to the Senate and an amendment was tacked on in the Senate

to provide that 50 percent of the reclamation fund going into the Treasury every year up until that time should not go into the Treasury, but should go into a revolving fund to be used for new reclamation projects, or something of that kind. There was a little logrolling somewhere—you know what logrolling is—you vote for me and I vote for you—and as a result the project that we defeated in this House was tacked on over in the Senate, along with the reclamation fund amendment. When it came back here in a conference report the report was adopted. There was enough money involved in those amendments to pay pensions to Congressmen for a hundred years. That was right at the time when this article was printed in the Reader's Digest. I thought then if some of those people from the sections of the country affected knew they had something to fall back on if defeated they might not have cast their vote for those two amendments. This argument seems reasonable. Think it over.

There are only five Members of this House who were Members when I came to Washington to work as a secretary. One of them is our beloved Speaker, but thank God, he is not old enough to retire under the provisions of the law even if he desired to leave, a day I hope never to see arrive.

Under the amendments I am entitled to credit for part of the time I served as a secretary as well as for my services from the Sixty-ninth Congress to the Seventy-seventh Congress, which is now in session.

I do not know the exact amount I will have to pay, but I am aware of the approximate amount which is around \$8,000. As I have said several times I will never take advantage of the law unless I pay the back money. On top of that I will also be required to pay \$41.67 a month as long as I remain here. I am not at the moment old enough to retire, but I regret to say that date is not far distant.

Now in all kindness let me ask those who have criticized the amendments if I am going to get something for nothing if I do live to take advantage of the act, paying the back money?

When the original Retirement Act was passed, provisions were made therein for immediate retirement of those who had reached retirement age. They were retired by the thousands, all receiving their annuity for the rest of their lives without contributing one cent to the retirement fund. From time to time numerous amendments have been adopted to the Retirement Act.

The Civil Service Commission says that four ten-thousandths of a million and one-quarter persons now subject to the retirement law represents 531 Members of this House. In other words, one Member of Congress to every 2,500 persons who are now subject to the law.

The Library of Congress gives the following information in reference to the length of service of Members of the House:

Generally, the average Member has served two and one-half terms. We have made a statistical survey of the length of service of

House Members from 1789 through 1938. During that time 8,005 persons served in the House. Of these, 38 percent served 1 term; 27 percent, 2 terms; 15 percent, 3 terms; 7 percent, 4 terms; 4 percent, 5 terms; 3 percent, 6 terms; 2 percent, 7 terms. The general average would not be affected very much by the compilation of figures for the past 3 years.

Now remember one cannot benefit until he has a 5-year service, so therefore 65 percent in 149 years served less than two terms and would never have been eligible for recognition under the law. Then again it must be remembered that Members who have 5 years or more service, but who, at the time they leave the service, have not reached the age limit, they too would not be entitled to annuity benefits. A Member of Congress under the law must have had at least 5 years of service and have reached the age of 62 to receive a deferred annuity.

The Civil Service Commission advises that those who say a Member of Congress can buy a \$4,100 annuity upon payment of a single premium of \$1.40 speak of a condition that does not and cannot exist. That is the language of the Civil Service Commission. A Member of Congress, the Commission says, with 5 years' service, who is 62 years of age, could receive an annuity of \$500, if under the Retirement Act.

I doubt if there are more than three or four Members of the House and Senate combined who would be entitled to \$4,100 even if they paid back the assessments from the date the Retirement Act went into effect.

When the bills come up in the future appropriating the millions of dollars out of the Treasury of the United States, out of the taxpayers' pockets if you please, let us see how many Members on this floor are going to oppose the appropriation. Of course you are not.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is another misapprehension that many people have in good faith that ought to be cleared up. They think that the Government pays the expenses of the Congressmen, Members of the House and Senate. Furthermore they think that food, shaves, and everything like that are furnished free. Now, many people think that, but they are absolutely mistaken. They do not realize that Members of Congress have to maintain two homes. A lot of people honestly think that we live in the White House. I have had people from my district in all good faith say, "Why, you live in the White House." Furthermore, I do not know an easier touch in the world than a Member of Congress. I get \$10,000 a year and I mark off \$2,500 each year for touches and donations, and I think everybody else does that.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman is correct; I have heard the same thing. Free shaves and haircuts. I was in the barber shop yesterday getting a haircut and instead of getting it for nothing I paid 75 cents. About all Members of Congress get for nothing is abuse. I have given the best years of my life to public service. I appreciate more than I

can say the confidence my people have had in me and always will. I have really been subject to little criticism. I am always willing to give a report of my conduct to the people I represent. Undoubtedly on some votes I have made a mistake but it has been an honest mistake. It is my opinion when the people understand this law they will say it is a good law.

In conclusion, let me say the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], a man we have always respected, certainly is no more responsible than the rest of us for the passage of this act, because, with but two exceptions, no one voiced their objections at the time it passed.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, at the moment this so-called pension bill was before the House I was not on the floor, but in theory I say that it was my duty to be on the floor of the House and it was my duty to know what was in the bill. That is the theoretical duty of all Congressmen. That is what we are here for. We cannot alibi ourselves by saying we did not know the contents of that bill and that we did not know that it was coming before us and by the statement that we were not here. I realize, of course, that there have been up to date introduced in the House 6,550 bills and in excess of 2,000 in the Senate besides innumerable resolutions. I also fully realize that as a rule only those bills which are not controversial are placed on the Consent Calendar, and, of course, the Members know that.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. There is a very voluminous House Calendar here of the House at the moment. Does the gentleman want the impression to go out that he knows the contents of that House Calendar?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Absolutely not; but in theory it is my duty to know it, and that applies to every one of us.

May I say another thing, following up the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]? I had a long talk with a former and distinguished Speaker of this House upon the identical question, and he pointed out to me that he thought we would get a better, a more sound, and a more independent action on the part of the House if the future of the Members was made more secure by some sort of a pension or some sort of an annuity in event of their involuntary retirement. I want it understood that what I have to say on this subject does not apply to the present Congress. Many of you Members have spent the best years of your life in this Chamber, giving to the country the very best that was in you. In your declining years you may find somebody else taking your place and you find yourselves without any security for the future. Is it right that we place ourselves in a different category than we

have placed the Federal judiciary of this country? The distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is present. He will tell you that every Federal judge is retired not on a certain percentage of what he has been earning—he is retired upon full pay. In addition, no Federal judge contributes one dime to the make-up of the fund out of which he is paid. You will see that judges are much more favored than ourselves.

I say this to you. I believe if the future of every man and woman in this House were made reasonably secure, we would not be so subject to the group pressure that sometimes takes place in this country. I think the country would get value received.

When I say this I am not reflecting on any Member of this House, because I love and respect everyone in this Chamber, but I cannot believe the members of any body are entirely blind to this situation if we want to be realistic about the whole matter. Maybe it was a bad time to have the matter considered. I talked about this bill the other day. I am not criticizing the Congress for passing it, but I am criticizing the Members of this Congress for considering this matter before they took care of the aged and needy people of this country. There are discharge petitions—in fact, I filed one myself—on the Speaker's desk to bring before this House bills that would give to the aged and needy people of this country something with which to live decently, and we cannot get enough Members to sign those petitions to bring these bills out for consideration on the floor of the House. I do not ask you to vote for any of these bills, but I ask the Members of the House to be just enough to the aged and needy people of this country to have a bill considered on the floor of the House in order to do the right thing by them. If the bill does not meet your ideas about what such a bill should contain, write it so that it will meet your ideas of justice. I do not think we can do less.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. Were not these people provided for under the social-security law that we passed in this House?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; in a way; but not entirely, because there are many persons who do not come under the social-security law at all. They are not employed and have not been for years. They find themselves at the age of 60 or 65 out of work and can get no work, and are poverty-stricken. I appeal to the Members who have not signed the petition to do so now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this extra time, because I felt that to cover the subject adequately from the viewpoint of one who has had the ex-

perience that I have would probably require more time.

When I was in the Postal Service and the Congress of the United States first enacted a Retirement Act, we were arbitrarily assessed 2½ percent of our salaries, whether we liked it or not, and regardless of our approval. That sum was deducted from our wages and went into a fund to retire immediately our superannuated employees.

I was one of those who had helped in and out of the mail cars infirm men who were no longer fit to pursue their daily vocation to go along on the trains. They were not fit to do their work, but the Government did not discharge those men because they were physically disabled.

I well remember one man with feet so crippled that we had to help him in and out every time. He was practically unfitted to do anything in the mail car except such work as he could do while sitting down. I know of another instance of a man who was subject to vertigo and lumbago. He would fall over in the car. The railroad company finally made an issue of it with the Government, and said, "You have to take that man off. He is too much of a hazard. He will fall off sometime and be killed. You have to get him out of there." These are the kind of men who were retired on contributions out of our pockets.

A little later on the Congress enacted an act that increased the contribution to 3½ percent. It was not until a subsequent retirement act that the Government participated in any form by act of Congress in the granting of these annuities.

When such bill came before the Seventy-sixth Congress it came from the Committee on the Civil Service. Every member of the committee voted it out, but when it got on the floor it was the subject of debate and it was defeated. I defended that bill at that particular time, and I do not retract a single word I uttered. In that speech I pointed out that when Thomas Paine was languishing in a garret in Paris it was James Monroe who went there and resurrected and rehabilitated him and brought him back to the United States, and it was a munificent Congress that voted him an annuity and gave him a farm at New Rochelle, where he subsequently died.

I pointed out that there were nearly as many judges subject to receiving the full annuity without having contributed one penny as there were Members of Congress. I got the figures fresh from the Department of Justice before I debated the issue that day.

I pointed out what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] has so ably referred to, that retirement was munificently voted by the Congress to the members of the armed forces of the United States, naval officers and Army officers, who can retire at the end of 20 years.

I pointed out all those issues, and then I came down to the present and discussed the issue as it arose in our day. Again, when the bill was before the Committee on the Civil Service for a long time, and my colleagues on that committee know it was. Finally it was

voted out and put on the calendar. When it was on the calendar there was not a voice raised in opposition on the floor of this House. I walked across to the chairman of the committee and said, "This bill is going through easily today as contrasted to the difficulty we had in the Seventy-sixth Congress."

We must bear in mind that certain Members of Congress, from their former status as employees of the legislative branch of the Government of the United States, are already members of the retirement fund, although presently in elective status as successors to the Members of Congress they formerly served.

Now, that is exactly the conversation that transpired between the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] and myself on the floor here, and it did go through. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] is correct as to the great amount of debate they had in the Senate and the publicity that was given it in the newspapers, and I decry the attitude of the press of the country in undertaking to misrepresent the true facts of the situation; he is not guilty of sneaking the bill through—it had abundant publicity.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] in his discussion here mentioned what he would have to pay back, and I would point out that even if he pays it back he is obliged to pay the interest on his own money that he does pay back for the period of time for which he will take credit. This is something that has been overlooked. Any man who has served the Government before and undertakes to pay up for the back time is going to be required to pay the interest on the money in order to get full credit the same as if the Government had extracted it from his wages from the time he starts to take credit. This is an item that the public is not enlightened upon and it does amount to considerable to men with long service.

I also want to call attention to some of the issues that are being raised here that are no cause for any disturbance whatever.

I got hold of a clipping that I was informed appeared in the press. The reason I asked for this time is because I want to read it to you. This is from the Wall Street Journal. It comes from an ultra conservative paper, one that has so frequently voiced opposition to the Congress of the United States and one that has frequently, within my own knowledge, published statements that this particular Congress or that particular Congress should go home and let the public adjust itself to the conditions that are existing and forget about it. I have read such things in the Wall Street Journal many times. This is what I want to put in the RECORD at this point, embodying it as a part of my own remarks:

PENSIONS FOR CONGRESSMEN

Long ago, when this writer was a reporter in the House of Representatives Press Gallery, he indicated to "Uncle Joe" Cannon, of Illinois, his disgust with an action which the House had just taken. That fine veteran of legislation gave advice which ran somewhat like this:

"Young man, at your age it is right that you should be impatient with what was done here today. But if you will watch this Congress over the years, as I have done, you will have more faith in it. Many weak men come here. So do many men of not great intelligence. There are a few venal men. As they go along they do weak and foolish things. But over the long run this Congress will do the right thing, and it will do the courageous thing. It must be so until such time as the country itself chooses to be weak and foolish."

The incident is recalled by the "bundles for Congress" satirization of the action of Congress in setting up a pension fund for its Members.

It is always good when a Government official is reminded that he should not take himself too seriously. We have had too few, not too many, recent reminders that the Government's power derives from the people and that it is the people's money that the Government official spends. So perhaps the "bundles for Congress" was a healthy sign. But if it is a condemnation of the legislative branch of our Government, then it must also be a condemnation of the watchfulness and sagacity of all of us, for we elected these men.

We have not done nearly as good a job in those elections as we might do, but the truth is that we have done a better job than most of us realize; and, if one considers the real thought expended on it by the average voter, the job stacks up remarkably well.

This is the Wall Street Journal saying this:

There are five-hundred-odd Members of Congress. Go into the business world, into the professions, or any other walk of life and choose 500 men. See if for all all-around intelligence, diligence, and knowledge of their work, they match the American Congress. We doubt if they will.

True, there are time servers and there are demagogues in Congress. There are also men who work at their tasks and become experts, and mostly the general public never hears of them, and never thinks to honor them. A good many of these men have served well for long years and retired poor. Undoubtedly they had and rejected opportunities to find financial security for themselves. Some, but not a great many, recoup their fortunes by becoming lobbyists. Some are frankly lame ducks, glad to get a minor governmental appointment.

If we would consent to pay our legislators more, we would get better legislators. If we are not willing to do that, why should we not lift from the men from whom we expect independent action, the specter of poverty for themselves and their families? We do it for judges and for the employees of State, Federal, and city governments. Why not also for Members of Congress?

Now, in conclusion, let me say that when I left the Postal Service the law was such that I was paid back what money had been deducted from my salary. If I were to undertake to take credit for the preceding time that I have served in the employment of the Government, I would be obliged to pay back into the retirement fund of the United States the money that was paid back to me in the year of 1926. So there is not any hocus-pocus or anything foolish about it, and the extravagant claims that have been asserted are ridiculous. The statement that was in the Star last evening and on the front page of the Washington Post this morning beggars description when you measure the irresponsible statements with the editorial policy of those papers and take into consideration the statement there that the President would get

so much money if he retired. It is not true; it is impossible; it is something that does not exist, and it is contrary to a proper conception and legal application of the act. I hope that those who feel disturbed about the subject will confine themselves more to the facts that are involved in this issue and I trust that it will subside, because in the letters I have written to my inquiring constituents no one has been criticized and I have unhesitatingly given them truth and facts.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to pay my personal tribute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], one of the ablest and most sincere Members of this House. I think he has done a magnificent job as chairman of the Committee on the Civil Service. He has certainly taken care of all of the employees under civil service. He has done much more than that, and when he brought this bill to the floor of the House, I do not mind telling you that the majority of the Members with whom I talked, and there were quite a number, thought it was an excellent bill. I sincerely hope that all Members who were so happy over the idea of getting an annuity in their old age will get up on the floor of the House and tell the House and the country how they feel about it, or how they did feel about it before the newspapers reported so many misstatements and misinterpretations of the bill. I hate to think that there is any Member of Congress who has not the courage to stand up for his or her convictions. I do not mind telling you that I was very glad to know that if and when I am leaving this House I shall not have to get somebody to support me. I am finishing my ninth term, 18 years in Congress, and I have never succeeded in saving a nickel since I have been here. If I left Congress tomorrow and I did not have a pension, somebody would have to take care of me. However, I am not worrying about myself particularly, because I do not expect to leave Congress very soon. I have been informed by my constituency that I can stay here just as long as I do a good job. That is a pretty nice situation to be in; but there are many Members who have given the best years of their lives to this Congress, and I know a lot of them on both sides of the House who are not so fortunate, and I have no doubt that if tomorrow or next November they were retired from Congress, they might find it pretty difficult to get their next year's rent. So I think the gentleman from Georgia, BOB RAMSPECK, has done a swell job for all of us, and I sincerely hope you will forget about all of this foolish newspaper criticism and realize the truth of what is in this bill, and that you will stand by the gentleman from Georgia, BOB RAMSPECK, and not let him have to assume the responsibility that apparently the newspapers of the country are trying to pin on him. Because for some reason unforeseen at the moment I might find it necessary to retire, I was rather interested to know exactly what I would get in case I did not have my congressional check to pay my bills. I shall read the information I received from the Civil Service Commission. I

do not mind telling you that I am qualified for retirement, because I have reached that age.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. GORE. The statement which the gentleman has just made belies her appearance, and I think it is the ultimate of candor.

Mrs. NORTON. I thank the gentleman, and I would not be human if I did not like the gentleman's remarks. However, being interested, I inquired, and the Commission informed me, in order to get \$2,535.71 a year, I would have to pay in \$8,028.25. That is the sort of pension or annuity or whatever you please to call it that so much fuss is being made about.

It is rather bad when the country gets the impression that we are trying to retire ourselves at the expense of the Government, but is it not a fact that we have voted retirement and very generous retirement to all other Federal employees, and are we any different? Are we not just as hungry as anybody else, and are we not just as much in need of an annuity if the time comes when we can no longer depend upon our own efforts? In conclusion, I shall read one editorial that I think is worth recording, because it is the only one I have seen that has been in favor of this pension. The title is "Why Not Pensions for Lawmakers?" and it reads as follows:

WHY NOT PENSIONS FOR LAWMAKERS?

Criticizing Congress is a popular sport in some quarters. Ordinarily, no great damage is done, but the pastime shouldn't be carried too far.

Just now our national lawmakers are being lambasted because they have approved a law granting the benefit of Uncle Sam's pension system to Members of the House and Senate. It is being pictured as a raid on the Treasury, and most fantastic tales are told about its possibilities.

On the Pacific coast, someone has started a bundles-for-Congress movement, in an effort to ridicule and, if possible, destroy an essentially worthy project.

The Federal retirement system now covers more than 1,000,000 civilian employees. They contribute 5 percent of their wages, and the Government puts up an equal amount.

Under the new system Members of Congress will be admitted on exactly the same terms as other public servants. What is wrong with that?

Federal judges, Army and Navy officers, and enlisted men are assured liberal pensions—much more liberal than those proposed for Members of Congress—and they are not asked to contribute a penny to the cost.

May I digress for a moment to say that one of the gentlemen on the other side of the Capitol who has been loudest in his condemnation of this pension or annuity, whatever you want to call it, has a brother who is drawing something like \$4,500 a year from the Government, and who never contributed a nickel toward it. To continue with the editorial:

As Congressman ROBERT RAMSPECK, of Georgia, stated in the House the other day: "If Members of Congress were excluded from the provisions of the Retirement Act, they would be the only group of Federal officers and employees without retirement security."

The total cost, if all the Members took advantage of the law, would be only about

\$500,000 a year, instead of \$30,000,000 a year, as some critics have claimed.

Labor has always championed old-age pensions. It knows of no reason why Members of Congress should be the "forgotten men" of social security. If there are defects in the law, they should be corrected, but in principle the legislation is certainly entitled to public approval.

I thank you, gentlemen, for the attention you have given me, and I sincerely hope that you will stand with BOB RAMSPECK because of the excellent job that he has done for all of us.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report (H. Res. 438, Rept. No. 1769) on the bill (H. R. 6293) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States, for printing in the RECORD:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6293) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

PENSIONS FOR CONGRESSMEN

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I did not expect to take part in this discussion this afternoon, but in view of some of the statements which have been made, I thought I should say a few words.

Let me state at the beginning that as a member of the Committee on the Civil Service, I am not charging the chairman of that committee with any trickery or any chicanery, any statement that may have been made notwithstanding. I did, however, suggest to the chairman on the floor of the House the next day when he was present that I felt that, he knowing my attitude toward this question, and me being a member of that committee, he should have notified me that he was going to bring the measure to the floor of the House. I was not present on the floor at that time, although I had been away for only a few minutes. I agree with other Members that it is our duty to be here. I had stepped out for a few moments, but I did feel, however, that since the measure was so important, it should have been brought to my attention. And you know good and well it should have been brought to the attention

of this membership and the bill carefully explained.

I do not believe that very many Members of the House even realized that that bill was amended in the other body and that we did not pass on exactly the same legislation when in this House the Senate amendments were agreed to. Although I do not agree, I appreciate the courage on the part of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. Norton] in expressing her views on the subject. I agree with her that if you are for this bill you should stand up and vote for it. And I say further, if you are opposed, then vote against it. That is all I am asking for this afternoon. I want to bring this question before the House and discuss it in an orderly manner. Then vote on it. Let us bring it out, and those of you who are in favor of this sort of thing, very well; but if you are opposed to it, vote against it, of course.

I have submitted a bill to repeal this particular part of the act that permits elective officials to participate in retirement funds. Those people to whom the gentleman from New Jersey refers, who have been so strongly in favor of this legislation, may stand up and say so and vote against my bill. Those who are opposed to permitting elective officers to come under the act vote for the bill. Let us do it square-toed. I think it is very unfortunate that this bill was not thoroughly and carefully explained on the floor of the House. It is true that when it came to the floor of the House the first time very little was said concerning it. I believe, as a matter of right, that the thing should have been brought out here and explained carefully. The measure was of too great importance to be placed on the Consent Calendar. I have always understood that measures with little or no controversy are placed on the Consent Calendar. This was a very important bill. It is an important law because it does involve the expenditure of a great deal of funds by the United States Government. It also affects retirement payments and retirement funds of many thousand Government workers.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I join with the gentleman in the expression of the confidence of the House in the chairman of the Committee on the Civil Service. I am not one who is disposed to accuse him of trying to put anything over on the House. However, the adoption of the bill has, in my opinion, very considerably lowered the standing of this House in the estimate of the people of the country. Public reaction to the bill is most unfavorable, and, irrespective of what you may think about it, it is going to force a reconsideration of the question on this floor. I hope the Committee on the Civil Service will report the repealing legislation that has been offered. If it is not reported, the country may expect the measure to come back here on a discharge petition, and when it comes I predict there will not be 50 votes in the House against repeal. I think it

has shocked the public sense of what is decent and right. I am not complaining of the public because of their denunciation of the measure. It ought to come back and it ought to be repealed. You cannot justify it in principle.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COX. You cannot, in principle, justify bringing an elective officer under any sort of retirement legislation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. He joined with me in 1939 in defeating the same kind of legislation when it was included in a bill that came to the floor of the House at that time. I do not believe anyone can charge me with being a demagogue on this proposition, because I have opposed it all the way along the line. I just do not believe in the principle of allowing pensions or retirement funds for elective officers.

Let me say again that those who do believe in such legislation, well and good. You have just as much right to your opinion on this question as I have. I do think this question should be presented separate and apart from other legislation, and be debated and voted upon on its merits. Let those who believe in this kind of legislation, vote for it and those who are opposed to it, be recorded against it.

Since we are operating under a democracy the democratic way of doing the thing is to bring this repeal bill to the floor of the House and then let us stand up and be counted, and if there are 100, 200, or a majority in favor of such legislation, let them vote for it. If they are not in favor of it let them oppose it, but let it come up for a fair test. I think the only fair thing to do now is to bring it up in a straightforward manner and vote on it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman, I believe, has introduced a bill seeking the repeal of this provision.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It includes Members of the House and Senate?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does it include the President and the Vice President?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It does not.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does it include the Members of the President's Cabinet?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It does not.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does it include the various heads of these bureaus and agencies whose salaries run from \$12,000 to \$15,000 a year?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It includes only elected officials.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But the bill we passed the other day includes

250,000 people. Why does not the gentleman introduce a bill to repeal all that we did?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think this problem should be dealt with separate from the others.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I notice in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 9, in an extension of remarks, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] says that the gentleman was mysteriously called away from the floor of the House about the time the bill was to come up, and attempts to leave the impression that there was some chicanery or something wrong going on. I just thought that in fairness to the members of the Civil Service Committee the gentleman should take this opportunity to explain whether anything like that occurred.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; I shall be glad to answer the gentleman's question. I never have charged the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] with chicanery or trickery. I explained that before. I did have a number of telephone calls on the afternoon the report was considered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. But in this extension of remarks it says the gentleman received a mysterious call that took him from the floor about the time the bill was brought up. Can the gentleman explain how Senator CAPPER would have put something in the RECORD that did not happen?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The fact is that I was called to the phone a number of times during that day, and was thereby off the floor, and it was so reported in a newspaper. I have not charged the chairman of having me called from the floor. The point is, that the whole matter should have been explained to the membership of this House, just as other legislation, much of which is of so much less importance, is explained and considered. Again, I say we should call the roll on a question that involves the welfare of those who are voting, as well as the interests of the people of this country. I believe the gentleman from Tennessee will agree with me on that proposition.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in defense of the Congress of the United States.

First of all, I want to exculpate the beloved chairman of the Committee on the Civil Service, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]. I am sure that none of the opponents or the protagonists of the congressional retirement annuity bill intends seriously to charge a man whom we all love and respect with any dereliction or any conscious attempt to slip

something over upon his colleagues. No, BOB RAMSPECK has not done anything like that, and I absolutely exculpate him from the charge of any shady dealing or underhanded methods.

If false assertion were argument and its reiteration proof, the case against the Members of the House of Representatives would be definitely closed. The newspapers of America have indulged in what seems almost to be a concerted and premeditated conspiracy to indict the Members of the House of Representatives for all the crimes on the calendar. One of the columnists of the Washington Times-Herald saw fit to criticize me on something I had said as a Member of the House, and in the course of his remarks, which he had a perfect right to make, of course, he proceeded to belabor the entire system in vogue in the House of Representatives. Among other things, he said that Members of Congress had free mail; in other words, they were engaged in some kind of peculiar underhanded plan or plot to cheat Uncle Sam out of postage. I went down and had a talk with this gentleman, Mr. Frank Waldrop, of the Washington Times-Herald. I asked him:

Do you pay postage out of your pocket for letters you write in the interest of your newspaper?

He said:

No.

I said:

Well, why are you talking about postage on mail dealing with the public business? Is there any employee working for a corporation, public or private, in America who pays postage out of his own pocket when he writes mail concerning the business of his employer?

There is not any. But against whom have all the jeremiaids been directed because we use franked mail? Why, Members of Congress. How much do we use? Nine hundred thousand dollars a year. Have we increased since 1933? Yes; but less than 10 percent.

What about the newspapers of America, represented by these gentlemen who sit above the Speaker's desk? Will they tell the country how much more it costs the taxpayers for the subsidy we give to them for the use of the second-class mailing privilege than the taxpayers actually take in? From \$90,000,000 to \$120,000,000 a year the newspapers of America are subsidized by the taxpayers because it costs us that much more to send out their newspapers through the mail than we receive from them.

Oh, they say Members of Congress have all kinds of perquisites. They say Members of Congress put members of their own families to work in their offices. Of course, it is a crime if you happen to have a cousin who is a skilled accountant or who is a skilled and experienced secretary. You should let that person starve or go to work for some private employer. Our newspaper critics would have you believe it reprehensible if you happen to have a relative in the third degree who is a skilled secretary, to employ her. I do not employ any relatives whatsoever in my particular office,

but I have never found in my mind any contempt for a Member, and there are not many Members who do it, who happens to have a member of his or her family who is a conscientious worker, who is energetic and painstaking, often working 12 and 14 hours, who is loyal to his or her employer, for employing such persons.

They say that Members of Congress are getting rich on \$10,000 a year. I have been around here a little over 5 years and I have not found many Members of Congress who have been able to save enough out of the \$10,000 a year they receive to put anything aside for old age. Why? Because we are living in the most costly city of America. The taxes on real estate here are the lowest in the Nation, and the rental cost of your apartment or the home you lease is the highest in the Nation—a strange anomaly. We are living in a situation where we have to maintain two homes, one in the National Capital and one in each of our districts. If you have a family, if you have three or four children, try to do anything on the \$10,000 a year. As the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] said, the average amount paid out by Members of Congress to charities alone approximates \$2,500 per year. There goes one-fourth of the Member's gross income.

These newspapers think that Members of Congress just go back home and announce they are going to run for reelection and the people rise up and say, "Boys, we will be glad to vote for you. Do not spend a nickel on your reelection campaign." Where do the newspapers think the reelection costs come from? Why, they come out of the pockets of the Congressmen. Yes; they may get a few donations, but they are conspicuously few.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, do you ever find any newspaper article attempting to defend Congressmen in any newspaper of America? No. Because if some member of the family happens to have rheumatism, if the attack on Pearl Harbor takes place on December 7 and you cannot find anybody against whom to direct your vilification and criticism, point to your Congressman. Write him and say, "It is your fault." Yes, it is always an open hunting season against Members of Congress. Ergo, the advertising-dominated press waited and leaped upon this innocuous bill costing the American people about \$80,000 a year, and I am not speaking to the merits or demerits of the bill. I am using this as a vehicle for getting something off of my chest.

I am weary of having newspapers which have received the benefits and generosity of the American people condemning Members of Congress and sowing the seeds of disunity and attempting to infuse into the minds of our citizens a

contempt for their legislative representatives. In heaven's name, have not these gentlemen of the fourth estate any respect for history and precedent? What happened to France? The people over there were taught to despise and ridicule their elected public officials. We had as a result a degeneracy in the French war effort and a mitigation of the esprit de corps of the volatile French. Have we reached a point in the United States where the newspapers, in effect and indirectly, are going to aid the Axis in attempting to inculcate in the American people doubt and distrust of democracy's highest elected officials?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I only have a minute.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I just want to inject this thought. I received a card the other day from some place down in Missouri asking me if I were one of the Benedict Arnolds.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I may say to the brilliant gentleman from Montana that I do not blame the general public for misjudging Congressmen and Senators, because, after all, they get their information from radio commentators and from newspapers; they form impressions on issues from articles written by the Westbrook Peglers, the William Randolph Hearsts, the Henry McLeMores, the Jay Haydens, and the Frank R. Kepts. Mr. Hearst the other night announced that Congressmen were substantially just a little lower than skunks. Mr. Westbrook Pegler likened Members of Congress to crooks, dupes, and traitors, some little time ago. Editorial writers have attempted to bestow upon Members of Congress abuse that is almost indescribable.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes. He is bringing out much worth-while material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I believe the gentleman stated that a young man in Congress can get a better deal out of an insurance company for an annuity than he can out of this bill.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. This bill is so feeble and innocuous and pays such a small amount of money that it seems to me the furore it was used as an alibi to foment is like what Shakespeare said, "Much ado about nothing." But the American people have been induced by the newspapers to wait until they could finally find some excuse to leap upon as a drowning man clutches at a straw. They were persuaded by the newspapers and radio commentators to jump on this.

In the State of Washington, in the city of Spokane—which, by the way, I do not represent; it is represented in

Congress by the able gentleman from my State, my colleague the Honorable CHARLES H. LEAVY—there is a group of humorists known as the Athletic Round Table. I have nothing but friendship for these gentlemen. It is perfectly all right for them to indulge in a little good humor. But the basis of the findings of the Athletic Round Table was received from a newspaperman who was writing dispatches from Washington, D. C.

The Spokane newspaper published a story that this bill provided a minimum of \$4,500 a year, that it was payable the moment a Congressman went out of the House of Representatives, and that there were no contributory payments made by the Members of Congress; so the people in that area have been led to believe that this bill is entirely different from what the gentleman from Georgia and the Committee on the Civil Service brought out. In other words, it was a calculated and deliberate misrepresentation of the facts as they actually existed at this time.

The newspapers have been advised by the United States Civil Service Commission as to the truth concerning this bill in a dispassionate and objective statement issued by that nonpartisan and nonpolitical body. The actual facts concerning the measure have been given to them. Have they been published anywhere? Yes. Labor, the official publication of the Railroad Brotherhoods; the Christian Science Monitor; the Wall Street Journal—possibly a dozen nationally prominent newspapers have seen fit to give the other side of the story.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY. I cannot help but report that, as far as the press in my own district is concerned, practically all the leading papers put my analysis of the situation and also the Civil Service Commission press release in the same issue, which shows their fair attitude as far as the legislation is concerned.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I compliment the gentleman upon the fine character of the newspapers in his district. But Wisconsin is traditionally a progressive State. I am not singling out individual newspapers; I am talking about the press in general.

This is no isolated case. This particular case involving the congressional retirement annuity bill is not different from a great many other cases. Many newspapers have said Congressmen get free barber-shop privileges. They know it is a lie. There are no free barber-shop privileges for Congressmen.

They say we get 20 cents a mile and that we are grafting on it. Twenty cents a mile. Let us figure that out for just a minute. Does anybody pay the mileage of the Congressman when he goes from his home city to the remote sections of his district? No. There is no provision in the law for that at all. He must pay it out of his own pocket. There is nothing said about that.

When you begin to make a break-down of this \$10,000, the total net drops to

relatively insignificant proportions. That is something the people back home have never been taught to understand. They have never been given the facts on the Congressman's side of this whole controversy. They have never been told about the cost of living in Washington; they have never been told about the cost of reelection expenses every 2 years. They have never been told about the cost of maintaining two homes; they have never been told about the enormous number of charitable expenditures to which a Congressman is subject.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman bring out the matter of the income tax that we pay?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. The public has been led to believe that we pay no income tax, whereas, as a matter of fact, all Members of Congress pay a Federal income tax, and many of them pay a State income tax in addition. The voters have never been taught to see the Congressman's side. After all, we are the people whom the public elect. Every Congressman is up for reelection every 2 years. Yet any person has a perfect liberty to run against him if they think they can do a better job.

I have been here over 5 years and happen to be a member of the Democratic Party, but from my observation of my colleagues in this body I have found them all to be as fine a group of men and women, and as representative a segment of able and honest men and women, as can be found anywhere in the world. The Members of Congress are generally conscientious workers. They do not work any mere 8-hour day. Any of these newspaper men can go over in the New or Old House Office Buildings many a night at 7 or 8 o'clock, or go there from 7 in the morning on, and see the offices of the Members of the House of Representatives busily functioning. They are not living up to any union rules of hours limitation. The Members of Congress have to perform a difficult job.

Nothing has been said by the newspapers about the trebling of the work upon which the Congressmen have had to engage since December 7. Nothing has been said about the requirement for Congressmen to be away from the floor of the House of Representatives necessarily in work for their committees, such as the Committee on Appropriations, which is constantly functioning, or in contact with Government departments in very necessary and indispensable work in behalf of their constituents at home.

One reads articles in newspapers and magazines frequently reflecting upon the intelligence, honesty, acumen, energy, patriotism, and eloquence of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives. Seldom, if ever, has anyone sought to secure the facts. Twenty years ago sessions of Congress consumed an average of 9 months out of each 24. During the remaining 17 months of the 2-year sessions of Congress the Member was expected to be in his home district where he could renew his contacts with his intimate friends and neighbors; where he could work on his own farm or in his urban garden; where, if a lawyer,

he could resume the private practice of law, or if a journalist, could re-enter upon active identification with his newspaper. During those 17 months the Member could avoid the tremendously augmented outlay for living expenses necessitated by his intermittent life in the National Capital. In the summers he could sojourn in a country home, if any, humble as it usually was in most cases. His secretarial staff could ease up on their arduous tasks, enjoy vacations, revel in the affectionate associations of their own family circle. Contrast that with today. The Senator or House Member is required to remain in the National Capital, virtually 12 months of the year. There have been no vacations in the last two congresses. No opportunity is afforded to those Members who represent constituencies west of the Mississippi River to return home except at rare intervals, and then at sacrifice of valuable time and personal funds.

Competition is keen. The home people expect their Member to bring home the bacon. He must contribute to securing projects and Federal aid for worthy enterprises within his own district. He cannot be laggard or negligent in performing these duties. The Member must entertain here numerous visitors from home, in one form or another.

A Member of Congress does not enjoy any long-distance telephoning at public expense. The use to which he may put telegrams charged to the Government is strictly circumscribed. Senators and House Members pay out of their own pockets for all special-delivery stamps, for mail sent to foreign countries, and, except for a recent very small allowance granted in the House, for air-mail stamps. The clerks and secretaries of Members must pay out of their own pockets for transportation to and from the home district of their chief. Thus they have a bizarre situation, whereby Senators and House Members' closest helpers are the only group of employees in the Government service whose travel expenses while engaged in Government business are not underwritten by the Federal Government but must in fact be paid for by such clerks or secretaries. In my judgment, this is a damnable situation and should be remedied. A country which can rush through a \$500,000,000 loan—which, forsooth, is a gift—to our friendly neighbor, China, has been too devoted to economy to pay the actual traveling expenses of the secretarial staff of the men whom the people elect to represent them in the Halls of Congress. I have had a bill pending before the House Committee on Accounts for several years which would provide a panacea for this indefensible injustice.

Many columnists have ridiculed Congressmen in bitter and vitriolic diatribes as a group of grabbers, gougers, and cheaters, who sneak up adventitiously and extract greedily from the Public Treasury, by some subterfuge, an armful of greenbacks ostensibly for some worthy purpose, actually as a secret perquisite. Thus we have been indicted for the crime of not paying rent for our official offices. We are abjured to pay such rent. Why the Nation's lawmakers should be singled

out for abuse in this regard is beyond my comprehension. It must be because of jealousy or envy that newspaper writers make such asinine and stupid charges. There is no public official in America, from the highest to the lowest, whose official office is not paid for by the taxpayers.

The only exception would be those minor public officials who are paid on a fee basis and such fees are gaged in consideration of rentals, among other things. Yet many Congressmen, when in their home districts, are compelled to pay rent for their congressional offices out of their own private funds. I personally have had to rent offices in private office buildings during each of the brief periods when I have been able to get back to my home district since the inception of my service in Congress.

Yet Congressmen do not go around and engage in any crybaby act. They have not sought maudlin sympathy. They know they have the right to resign if they do not like their jobs. Most of them love the work upon which they are engaged, nerve-racking as it is. Most of them have a remarkable predilection for public service.

The longevity of the Members of Congress is not something about which any physician would enthuse. Members die frequently and usually suddenly. The nerve strain is terrific. The irregularity of meals, sleep, exercise, the inaccessibility to fresh air contributes to chronic poor health and inability to resist illness.

Commencing in 1937, Congress has been in session each summer in the National Capital, with the exception of 1938. Need I enlarge upon the enchanting attractions of the tropical climate of Washington, D. C.—her ineffably humid, and torturing, torrid, and trying days of smothering summer heat.

There are few men in Congress who possess private wealth. Most of them depend exclusively upon their salaries for the support of themselves and families. The \$10,000 annual compensation may seem formidable to the average person unfamiliar with the facts. I have outlined in this speech a few of the many inroads made in that gross income by inevitable expenses concomitant with service in Congress. If time permitted, and your patience would vouchsafe me the courtesy of listening to me, I could enumerate many more of the features of the life of a Congressman or Senator which have seldom, if ever, been told to the public of America through the medium of the printed word.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed at this time for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to enter into a controversy with the newspapers of the country because from experience I regard that as a futile task. The press has the last word, and, regardless of the merits of the controversy, they print whatever the editors please. Go back

over the years, in my city newspapers, and you will find that the newspapers have rarely ever urged the election of a Democrat to Congress, and in spite of their disapproval, with a few exceptions, the entire New York City delegation is composed of Democrats. So, if the influence of the average editor was as great as he wishes us to believe it is, there would be a Republican rather than a Democrat delegation in this House.

I do not propose to say anything about the chairman of the Civil Service Committee and the committee action on the pension bill, because the committee and the chairman need no defense at my hands. Chairman RAMSPECK is a fine, outstanding Member of this House, and his splendid record of service is the envy of all of his colleagues. The bill passed unanimously, and, therefore, it must have met with general approval. I am sorry, however, that some of the Members, under the barrage of newspaper attack, are running to cover by offering alibis of doubtful value. I have seen this same attack of "cold feet" on other occasions. I am not surprised, but disappointed to find it again on the pension bill.

I am not here to quarrel with any other Member for changing his mind on a bill, but certainly everyone in the House was talking about pensions for weeks before the bill was finally passed. There seems to be a lot of logrolling going on in connection with the bill, but I would like to direct my remarks to the merits of this legislation. In my State, New York, we have an employees' retirement system, which all members of the legislature may join. I happen to be a member of that system. I joined in 1924, after I was elected to the State senate and I have contributed over \$40 a month since coming to Congress. At the present time I am not eligible to retire on a pension, and I will not be eligible for many more years. However, I may withdraw my deposits at any time. It is my opinion that most members of our legislature have joined the system. As a result of being a member of that pension system, I do not know of a single man being defeated for public office.

It is not compulsory in my State nor here. At least, it is a good reason and a painless way to save money each month.

There is merit in the pension measure. The newspapers are attacking it not on the merits but from another angle. The editors think that election to Congress should not be considered a career. Rather, it should be accepted by the Member in the light of a passing experience, soon to be forgotten. This is a specious sort of reasoning. We all know that while a new man every few years may be a good thing for the district and the constituents, because a new Member may be enthusiastic and capable, and perhaps have greater knowledge of the duties than the present Member, yet we all know that experience must count for something. There is no substitute for experience. So if we had no other excuse to remain in Congress, we can claim that we have experience.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY. Just so we can keep the record straight, I would just like to ask who the gentleman had in mind when he stated that he thought the newspapers had frightened them, because I happen to be the one who started this field day here today, and I would like to know whether the gentleman meant me or not.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Of course, the gentleman knows that I never make my talks personal, and nothing I have ever said on this floor was ever directed to any individual. I do know, however, that the newspapers are carrying statements from Members to the effect that if they had known the bill was coming up they would have opposed it, and some have already introduced bills to repeal the law. Of course, I am not referring to the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY. In that connection, I would like to say that so far as the newspapers in my district are concerned, almost without exception, the surprising thing to me is that they have not said more than they have said in connection with this legislation, and I do not claim to be demagogic about it, either.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I would never suggest that the gentleman or any other Member is a demagog, and I am not directing my remarks especially to him. I am discussing the subject from an academic viewpoint. I recognize the right of the gentleman or the right of any Member to dissent.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, too much fuss is being made about this legislation, and, if experience in my State means anything, and it goes back many years, the average clear-thinking, thoughtful citizen will not criticize us for the pension bill recently passed. However, it is a good newspaper story and I feel the newspapers are making the most of it. I am sure that the young gentlemen who write these lurid stories would be delighted if their employers would provide a pension for them, and which they richly deserve.

I hope that any bill to repeal the pension benefits will not succeed because I think we would be making a serious mistake and acting as demagogues.

Members of Congress do an excellent job. In addition to all the other qualifications, they are required to be gentlemen and maintain themselves in keeping with the dignity of their office. Certainly, if you measure up to the accepted standard, you are entitled to a pension in proportion to your years of service. I trust that this proposed bill to repeal the present pension law will fail.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GORE). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, last night the assistant coach at West Point came to my office, apparently in perfect health. He made a date to come back this morning at 9 o'clock to discuss the possibilities of West Point. He did not come. The reason for his failure to keep his appointment was that he died suddenly this morning. Though he knew not when his Maker would issue the beckoning call, his last words were words of praise for his fellow men, especially the Congressmen, and the cadets at the United States Military Academy at West Point.

If I knew this were the last minute I had to live I would like to say one thing in connection with my remarks with reference to retirement annuities for Congressmen, that what I have said or what I may say in the future, it has not been my intention and will not be my intention to cast any reflection on the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], chairman of the Civil Service Committee, or any of the members of that committee. I wish to state while I am alive, that I desire to clear up any construction of anything that may have been said by me. There is not a finer man in the House than the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]. It was not through any subterfuge on the part of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] or members of the committee that this bill was passed. I want to say that the gentleman from Georgia has a good reputation and a fine character. I want you men to know it. You Members are aware of that fact. I desire that the people be so informed. Although I may differ with him on the passage of some of these bills, I want his friends to know that he is one of the most upright, conscientious, honest, and able Members of this House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask when the rule for the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, which was granted by the Rules Committee today, will be taken up on the floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not in a position to advise the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I earnestly hope it will be soon.

Mr. COSTELLO. I understand it would not be possible to bring it up until possibly late next week, if then, judging from the statement made by the majority leader earlier in the day, and in view of the fact there will be no legislation tomorrow and the House will not meet until Monday, at which time an appropriation bill will be taken up.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In view of the fact that General Marshall has stated it is vital to watch our coast line, I earnestly hope it will be taken up early next week.

Mr. COSTELLO. I imagine it will be.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SATTERFIELD (at the request of Mr. BLAND), for today, to attend the funeral of a friend.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution amending section 7 of the Neutrality Act of 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

JOINT RESOLUTION AND ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 278. Joint resolution making an appropriation to provide financial aid to China.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 314. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens; and

S. 2182. An act to provide for temporary promotion in the Army of the United States of officers commissioned in the Air Corps or assigned to duty with the Air Corps.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 12, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold a public hearing on Thursday, February 12, 1942, on the following bills: H. R. 6138, H. R. 6441, H. R. 6534, and H. R. 6165.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Ways and Means on Thursday, February 12, 1942, at 10:30 a. m. to consider H. R. 6559, to provide for certain war displacement benefits, training wages, and travel allowances in connection with the national war effort.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, February 12, 1942, at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolution 263, to provide decorations for outstanding conduct for service by persons serving in the American merchant marine.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, February 17, 1942, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 6503, to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, February 19, 1942,

at 10 a. m., on H. R. 6554, to amend war-risk insurance provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to expedite ocean transportation and assist the war effort.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Indian Affairs on Wednesday, February 25, 1942, at 10:30 a. m., for the continuation of hearings on S. 1476 (Florida tick bill).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1384. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the estimates of appropriations included in the Budget for the fiscal year 1943 for the legislative establishment, Architect of the Capitol, involving an increase of \$33,240 in such estimates (H. Doc. No. 626); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1385. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on lists of papers recommended for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1386. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 6, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying paper, and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Coquille River and tributaries, Oregon, authorized by an act of Congress approved on June 11, 1935, and the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 620); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1387. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 4, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Nehalem River and tributaries, Oregon, authorized by acts of Congress approved on June 11, 1935, and February 26, 1936, and the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 621); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1388. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 22, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Broadwater Creek, Anne Arundel County, Md., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on December 10, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 622); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1389. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Acting Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 25, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on the Neuse and Trent Rivers, N. C., with a view to modifying the existing project for Trent River at New Bern, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 11, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 623); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1390. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 26, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on

a preliminary examination and survey of Way Cake Creek, N. J., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935 (H. Doc. No. 624); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1391. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 3, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Chittenango Creek and its tributaries, New York, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 625); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1392. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 3, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on the Redwood Creek, Calif., authorized by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 10, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1393. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a revised draft of a bill to further amend section 126 of the act of June 3, 1916, as amended, to authorize travel pay for certain military and naval personnel on discharge or release or relief from active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1394. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on lists of papers recommended for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1395. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for use of net weights in interstate commerce transactions in cotton, to provide for the standardization of bale covering for cotton, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. House Resolution 162 (77th Cong., 1st sess.) interim report. Special Committee No. 3, on Matériel, Procurement, and Personnel; without amendment (Rept. No. 1767). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 438. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 6293, a bill to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1769). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1688. An act for the relief of Homer C. Chapman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1768). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska:

H. R. 6578. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, for the purpose of making elective officers ineligible to receive annuity benefits under such act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 6579. A bill to provide for use of net weights in interstate commerce transactions in cotton, to provide for the standardization of bale covering for cotton, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 6580. A bill to grant allowances for laundry, cleaning, pressing, and barber service to enlisted men of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 6581. A bill providing direct Federal old-age assistance at the rate of \$40 per month to needy citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 6582. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 1 of Public No. 846, Seventy-fourth Congress (S. 3055) an act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES:

H. R. 6583. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Ohio:

H. R. 6584. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. R. 6585. A bill to provide for additional pay for work in excess of 40 hours per week in certain cases; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. WENE:

H. R. 6586. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, for the purpose of making elective officers ineligible to receive annuity benefits under such act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. J. Res. 280. Joint resolution amending section 7 of the Neutrality Act of 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. J. Res. 281. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the National Defense, Engineering, Petroleum, and Industrial Exposition to be held at Houston, Tex., from May 18-24, 1942, inclusive; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. J. Res. 282. Joint resolution creating a commission to investigate civil and military retirement systems of the Government of the United States and the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2418. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of the California State Employees' Association, memorializing the Federal Government to protect the retirement rights of former employees of the California Department of Employment who were transferred to the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2419. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, District Council No. 9, of New York City, favoring the passage of House bill 6465; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2420. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Los Angeles Realty Board, Los Angeles, Calif., urging the immediate need of removing alien Japanese from coastal areas for internment at points in the interior where there would be no opportunity for any of such groups to commit sabotage or any act inimical to the United States; that other members of the Japanese race be removed from the harbor district and other defense areas; that the reopening of the Japanese-language schools be prohibited during the emergency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2421. By Mr. ROLPH: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 18 of the State of California, relative to memorializing the United States Government to grant priorities necessary to the continued operation of the gold-mining industry; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

2422. Also, House Resolution No. 47 of the State of California, relative to a breakwater for the protection of Long Beach Harbor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2423. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition signed by residents of Macomb County, Mich., with respect to Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2424. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Steel Workers' Organizing Committee, Pottstown, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to unemployment compensation benefits and the present quotas for Work Projects Administration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2425. Also, petition of the American National Live Stock Association, held at Salt Lake City, Utah (office, Denver, Colo.), petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to sundry subjects; to the Committee on Agriculture.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we are grateful today for a living past; it lives in the throbbing heart of the present, urging us to greater deeds and vaster issues; it lives in the evolution of the right, justice, and honor. Today we hold in grateful memory a peerless man who ever sat at the fireside of the human heart, never lifting his hand to smite, but always raising it in benediction. We pray that we may so live and labor that our highest ambition shall be to be truly and sincerely esteemed by our fellow men.

Let Thy fatherly benediction fall in rich blessings upon the countless numbers who from their cots of affliction, from hospitals, from homes of anxiety and pain, are waiting for some message of cheer and hope; let Thy healing balm comfort with the solace of Thy tenderness. We pray that the shadows may soon lift from the gateway of the dawn and through the aisles of the future we shall soon hear the glorious anthems of the free. Grant that the life and death of Jesus of Nazareth may underlie all institutions and all magnanimous souls, thus bringing the divine light into the human and making clearer the outlines of a heaven on earth. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SELECTIVE SERVICE REGISTRATION OF MEMBERS ON FEBRUARY 16

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I have made arrangements through the Selective Service Bureau for the establishment of a booth in the corridors just outside the House Chamber for next Monday's registration of all Members of Congress who are required under the provisions of the Selective Service and Training Act to register.

I am happy to make this announcement, particularly on account of the presence of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. I hope everybody will be ready for registration.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. For the information of the Members generally, are we to understand that if a Member registers here his registration will be sent to his home State and district?

Mr. MAY. That is right; it will be forwarded by the board here. One of the boards of the District of Columbia will conduct the registration and the individual Member's registration will be immediately certified back to his home board.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. As I understand it, the registration on Monday is only for those between 21 and 45.

Mr. MAY. The Selective Service Board informs me that the registration takes in all men between the ages of 20 and 44, inclusive; and they interpret this to mean men who have reached their twentieth birthday as of December 31, 1941, and those who have not yet reached age 45.

The Presidential proclamation reads in part as follows:

All male citizens of the United States and other male persons who were born on or after February 17, 1897, and on or before December 31, 1921.

I may state as a matter of further information that the registration booth at the Capitol is exclusively for Members of the House and of the Senate. Employees should register at the registration places provided in the neighborhood where they live.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I think we owe the gentleman from Kentucky a vote of thanks, and I believe I express the sentiment of the whole House when I say we appreciate his effort in arranging for this registration.

Mr. MAY. I thank the gentleman.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

The booth for the registration of Members of Congress will be located in the

Rotunda of the Capitol on this floor and will open Monday morning. Senators as well as Members of the House will register at that place.

CONVERSION OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks by inserting an article appearing in this morning's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this minute to thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his kindness in listing me in the youthful class ready to register. I am ready to fight for my country even if I am not needed. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from the chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business for the day and other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I will not, may I suggest that I assume there may be some remarks made this day in honor of the great man whose birthday it is. I would suggest that the gentleman take his time after that.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I shall be pleased to do that. I propose to say something about Lincoln myself. I shall, however, be very pleased to accept the gentleman's suggestion in the matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I feel that we should give priority to those speaking directly on that subject.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. That is my subject, but I shall be very happy to yield to the suggestion of the majority leader.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York restate his request?

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes today after the disposition of the legislative business for the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include certain excerpts from a news article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the